THE BYZANTINE TRADITION AFTER THE FALL OF CONSTANTINOPLE

Edited by John J. Yiannias

UNIVERSITY PRESS OF VIRGINIA

Charlottesville and London

The University Press of Virginia

Second printing 1993

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

The Byzantine tradition after the fall of Constantinople / edited by John J. Yiannias.
p. cm.
Includes index.
ISBN 0-8139-1329-2
1. Europe, Eastern—Civilization—Byzantine influences.
2. Byzantine Empire—Civilization. I. Yiannias, John James.
DJK24.B985 1991
947—dc20 91-8474
CIP

Printed in the United States of America

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

John J. Yiannias

CONSTANTINOPLE fell to foreign invaders only twice in its long history, if we leave aside its occupation by Allied forces after World War I: in 1204 to the knights of the Fourth Crusade and in 1453 to the Ottoman Turks. The fall of 1204 and the subsequent sacking of the city by the Crusaders did long-lasting damage to the relations between the Western and Eastern churches, but the feudal state that the conquerors hastily put in place, the Latin Empire of Constantinople, had an even shorter life than some of its counterparts in the Holy Land. Its inherent weaknesses and the Byzantines' powers of recovery enabled Michael VIII Palaeologus to take back the city in 1261.

The fall of 1453, on the other hand, was not reversed. The Byzantine state had been moribund for the entire Palaeologan period and was now consigned to extinction. The Ottomans went on to enjoy additional military successes; in their new capital, as throughout the formerly Byzantine domains, minarets replaced belltowers; Constantinople became and remained Istanbul. Nevertheless the culture for which the city had been the crucible for over a millennium, and which in the final days of the empire had displayed one of its finest flowerings,[1] continued to provide the "nation" of Orthodox Christians subject to the sultan, and to some extent even the Turks themselves, with models that commanded respect and emulation. The Byzantine tradition of statecraft, thought, spirituality, and artistic expression was rendered only partially obsolete by the new order.

It may be debated how much a historical entity must change before it merits or requires a new name. The problem does not arise in the case of individual human beings, who give every appearance of subsisting continuously from the womb to the grave despite their cycles of cellular replacement and their personality changes. But in the case of cultures and civilizations the matter is less simple. Can the term *Byzantine* be justifiably applied

to historical phenomena of the period after the fall of the Byzantine Empire?

In the view of Arnold Toynbee, writing sixty years ago, a "Byzantine," or "Orthodox Christian," society (he used the terms interchangeably in this context) was one of a few living societies, which he distinguished on the basis of culture, some of the others being the Western, the Islamic, the Hindu, and the Far Eastern. All of them had a larger extension in space and time than any one of their constituent political communities; and he considered as belonging to the Byzantine society, despite modern political developments, Russia and the countries of southeastern Europe. Applying a biological metaphor in which societies are the "specimens" of a "species," Toynbee spoke of "apparentation" and "affiliation," and described the Byzantine and Western societies as being the morphologically differentiated descendants of a single society, the now extinct Hellenic.[2]

Whether one thinks in terms as broad as these or resolutely avoids doing so, it is safe to say that the forms under which life has been experienced in most parts of the world, at least until recently, have been remarkably constant from one generation to the next, except in times of cataclysmic social or environmental upheaval. While the Turkish overrunning of Byzantium presented most of the features of a true cataclysm to the peoples who were subjugated, it did not result in the eradication of their way of life.

The survival of some salient elements of this way of life is symbolized by the common use, in the Ottoman period, of the Turkish *Rumlar* and the Greek *ῥωμαῖοι* or *ρωμιοί* to refer to Greek-speaking Orthodox Christians.[3] These terms, based on the Byzantines' officially preferred name for themselves ("Romans"), surely betoken the awareness of an appreciable degree of cultural continuity between the earlier and later populations, a shared identity. In English there seems to be no adjective but "Byzantine" that can be applied to both historical phases of that "Roman" (more properly, Greek Christian) culture. To describe the phase occurring after 1453, modern scholars have had recourse (as will be seen often in the present volume) to the term *post-Byzantine*—a name predicated on the termination of Byzantium as a political organism, not as a culture.

Our main concern in this volume, however, is not the name to be given the tradition in question but the tradition itself, the ideas and practices that were inherited from the days of Byzantine sovereignty and handed down (or in some instances revived) within the Orthodox Christian world after the imposition of Ottoman rule. It has not been the goal to

determine how far into the modern period the Byzantine tradition has extended (although some of the papers allow inferences on this point) or to attempt a comprehensive survey.[4] Attention has been directed to a necessarily limited but fairly representative sampling of topics, which, it is hoped, will bring some important aspects of the tradition into sharper focus.

The contributions by Steven Runciman, Speros Vryonis, Jr., Miloš Velimirović, Charalambos Bouras, Gary Vikan, Thalia Gouma-Peterson, and the present writer reproduce, in widely varying degrees of revision, the papers delivered at a symposium organized by the present writer and held at the University of Virginia on April 15 and 16, 1988, under the title now used for the book. The positive responses to the symposium by those who attended it engendered the belief that the papers in collected form would make a welcome addition to the sparse literature on the subject in English. They are presented here with that idea in mind, accompanied by two contributions written especially for this volume by John Meyendorff and Aglaia E. Kasdagli.

The single institution most committed by its very nature, as well as by circumstances, to keeping viable the Byzantine tradition after the fall of the empire was the Orthodox Church; and ecclesiastical power, along with the civil privileges and responsibilities that it entailed within the Ottoman system, resided ultimately in the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople. Sir Steven Runciman's narrative takes us through the opening days of the Ottoman presence in Constantinople and portrays the conditions, some favorable and others oppressive, under which the ecumenical patriarchs and their flock managed subsequently to survive as a distinct community. The persistence and in some cases the resuscitation of characteristic elements of Byzantine formal culture in this community's legal concepts and practices, visual arts, calendrical observances, monastic life, and literary conventions are the topic treated by Speros Vryonis. His discussion suggests how pervasive were the patterns of thought and conduct inherited from Byzantium; but it has the added importance of drawing attention to the continued multiethnic composition of the Byzantine cultural world after 1453.

The diffusion and long-term potency of Byzantine ideas and norms outside the historical political boundaries of the Byzantine Empire are perhaps most dramatically illustrated in Russia. John Meyendorff provides a reassessment of Russia's "Byzantinism" in the period immediately preceding, and in the centuries following, the Turkish conquest of Byzantium,

pointing out the stresses to which certain elements of the Byzantine tradition were subjected as Muscovite Russia proceeded along its unique political course, and correcting the misperceptions to which the all-too-convenient formula of the "Third Rome" has given rise. The recent (1988) millennial celebration of the introduction of Byzantine Christianity into Rus' makes such an analysis particularly timely.

To the older motivations of social history has been added in recent years the desire to rescue from obscurity the realities experienced historically by women. Basic to the background against which gender discrimination in any society must be examined is the legal status of its women. Tapping a huge number of archival and other written sources reflective of daily life on the island of Naxos and in other localities in post-Byzantine Greece, Aglaia E. Kasdagli establishes Naxos as an instructive case of marked disparity between, on the one hand, the low social position of women and, on the other, their legally protected access to property. Some parallels with, as well as divergences from, Byzantine practice emerge in the course of her discussion.

In the latter part of our volume, the arts take center stage. The distinguishing characteristics of Byzantine music and its influence on the music of the Slavic world, particularly that of the South Slavs and Russians, are sketched by Miloš Velimirović. In this field of creativity as in so many others, the rich liturgical life of the Orthodox Church provided the main impetus. Velimirović's conspectus gives an idea of the obstacles to research, as well as the opportunities for it, that are presented by the manuscripts in which the achievements of this brilliantly cultivated but elusive art are encoded.

The visual arts are probably the most accessible components of the Byzantine tradition after the fall of Constantinople; yet, except for the icon-painting of this period, they are not widely known. Students of Byzantine art at one time routinely included in their purview the works produced by Eastern Christians after the Turkish conquest, but in this century Byzantinists, especially those writing in English, have tended to confine themselves to the art of the centuries before 1453. Unquestionably the fall of Constantinople sapped much of the artistic creativity of the Orthodox world; but it did not, by any means, stifle it.

The building of churches even remotely approaching that familiar symbol of Byzantium, Justinian's Hagia Sophia, in scale and structural daring had ceased in the empire long before the Ottoman conquest, and after the conquest even the less ambitious experiments of late Byzantine

architecture in planning and surface articulation became largely a thing of the past. But as Charalambos Bouras's paper makes clear, churches continued to be built in impressive numbers, when conditions permitted; and so long as they were conceived as symbols of the Orthodox community's ties with its own past, rather than as attempts at modernization along Western lines, almost all of these structures were dependent on Byzantine models. The scope of Bouras's survey and of his citations is indicative of the increased interest taken in the post-Byzantine period by architectural historians in the Balkans since the Second World War.

The art form through which the Byzantine tradition after the fall of Constantinople has gained the most exposure in the West is no doubt the icon. Thalia Gouma-Peterson describes the persistence of the Byzantine concept of sacred imagery through the times of social change and artistic evolution that followed the fall of Constantinople. The power of images to conjure up the values thought to be essential for the preservation of a community's identity has never been more clearly demonstrated than in the case of post-Byzantine icons, and to see them in this light is to understand better the significance of their distinctive visual qualities.

The manuscript described and analyzed by Gary Vikan, the Walters 535, attests to the revival in the late sixteenth century of a type of Byzantine illustrated book—the lectionary, or collection of liturgical Gospel readings—that had flourished over half a millennium earlier. We also learn, from Vikan's unraveling of its complex history, which involves his examination of some other manuscripts of the period, that the Walters lectionary bears eloquent testimony to the permeability of ethnic boundaries in the Orthodox world of the time, having been written by a Greek Cypriot hierarch resident in Wallachia, taken by him to Moscow possibly as a gift of the Rumanian voevod to the tsar, illustrated there by Russian artists, and eventually transported to the Holy Land.

If Byzantine culture continued after 1453 to be spread over a wide territory, it also had a place of concentration, a "clearing house" (in Speros Vryonis's words) in the Holy Mountain, Athos. The cultivation there of a tradition of monastic refectory decoration that had its roots in the pre-Ottoman period but can be seen at its flourishing in the post-Byzantine monuments, is the subject of the present writer's paper. No less than the church, of which it is in some ways an extension, and with which it is here compared, the refectory provided a setting for a selection of images owing its logic and inspiration to the religious vision of Byzantium.

The modern cult of nationalism, with its reordering of facts, and

rephrasing of myths, to facilitate the formation and advancement of nation-states, has not been conducive to the preservation of a balanced memory of Byzantium's role in the history of southeastern Europe, Russia, and the Near East. Nor have the surprisingly ephemeral (as it now seems) political ideologies and alignments of the recent Cold War, which, whether for better or worse, imposed new divisions on the map of the world in place of the old. It is hoped that the papers in this volume will contribute to a fuller definition of that role, by conveying collectively an impression of the considerable momentum that the Byzantine tradition proved itself capable of maintaining after the fall of Constantinople in 1453.

Notes

1. Steven Runciman, *The Last Byzantine Renaissance* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1970).

2. *A Study of History*, 2d ed., vol. 1 (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press; London: Humphrey Milford, 1935), Introduction; cf. vol. 12, *Reconsiderations* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1961), esp. 458. More recently Dimitri Obolensky has introduced as a working concept the idea of a "Byzantine commonwealth," in many respects like Toynbee's Byzantine society, but coterminous with the empire; yet he also stresses the survival of the Byzantine tradition past 1453 (*The Byzantine Commonwealth: Eastern Europe, 500–1453* [1971, 1974; rpt. Crestwood, N.Y.: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, (1982)]).

3. This may be an oversimplification of the intricate history of these usages, but I believe my underlying point to be valid.

4. For a thoroughly stimulating popularized discussion of Byzantine civilization and its cultural traces in present-day Southeastern Europe and Russia, see the article by Merle Severy, "The Byzantine Empire, Rome of the East," in the *National Geographic Magazine* 164 (July–Dec. 1983): 708–67.

"RUM MILLETI": THE OTHODOX COMMUNITIES UNDER THE OTTOMAN SULTANS

Sir Steven Runciman

THE LOSS OF FREEDOM is the cruelest fate that a people can suffer. To the Greeks the fall of Constantinople in 1453 has always been an unparalleled tragedy, marking the end of Byzantium, the Christian empire of the East, and their entry into captivity. With historical hindsight we can see that Byzantium was doomed, too sick to recover. Even if the gallant defenders of the city had succeeded in 1453 to force the Turks to raise the siege, it would only have been for a short respite. The Turks would soon have made another effort. And in the long run was the coup de grace so great a disaster? The Greek world was already fragmented, with far more Greeks living under alien domination, Turkish or Italian, than were still free. Would it not be a better thing for it to fall under a power that could reunite it, even though it would be reunited in captivity? What was the alternative?

There were some in Byzantium who hoped that Western powers might intervene to save the Christian empire. But would the Western powers ever bring themselves to cooperate in the task? And if they did, would they be effective? The so-called Crusades of Nicopolis and of Varna had shown that their troops were no match for the highly efficient and up-to-date Turkish army. Besides, Western help would only come if the Church of Constantinople submitted itself to the authority of the Church of Rome. Some statesmen thought the price worth paying; and a number of intellectuals believed that Byzantine culture should be merged with that of the West. But the average Byzantine, with memories of 1204 still vivid in his background, would never endure that. If Byzantium was to perish, let it perish with its Orthodoxy unblemished.[1] Many of them knew that their empire was doomed, piously seeing it as the punishment of its sins

and its apostasies. It was an age, too, of chiliastic notions. The coming doom was the beginning of the reign of Antichrist, to be followed by Armageddon and the end of the world. That final event, it was generally thought, would take place seven thousand years after its creation, which the pundits now dated at 5508 B.C. Maybe they were right. Simple arithmetic shows that the world thus ended in 1492, the year when Columbus discovered America.[2] There were just a few Byzantines, such as the historian Kritovoulos, who thought that the only solution now was for the Greek people to accept the sultan's rule.[3]

Yet when the climax came, the citizens of Constantinople, whatever each might think, came together as one in their brave, hopeless attempt to save their liberty. They fought in vain. By the end of May 1453 the city was in the power of the conquering sultan, Mehmet II.

Mehmet was a remarkable young man. He was able and farsighted beyond his years, self-reliant, secretive and devious, trusting no one, and utterly merciless when it suited him. But at the same time he had a respect for culture, an interest in philosophy and the arts, and a genuine concern for the general welfare of his subjects. He should not be regarded as a savage oriental tyrant but should, rather, be compared with the Italian princes of the time or with monarchs such as Henry VIII of England. He was not unfriendly to the Greeks. He had grown up at a time when Constantinople, decayed though it was politically, was still a renowned cultural center. He almost certainly spoke and read Greek; and he was interested in Greek philosophy. With the great city in his power he saw himself as the heir to the emperors. He ruthlessly eliminated any Greek layman of prominence. But once that was done he was ready to give his Greek subjects a guaranteed legal status.[4]

It was anyhow necessary to organize the Christian communities within the Ottoman dominions. Hitherto when Christian towns had been conquered and the lay officials dismissed, the Christian population had been leaderless except for the local bishop. But he had been appointed by the authorities in Constantinople. He was always tempted to remain there; and the Turks might not allow him to go to his diocese. If he was there he had no official sanction when he tried to deal with the Turkish governor. Now all this could be reordered. In the East nationality was usually considered to be synonymous with religion. Under the Muslim caliphs, who followed a system started by the Persian kings, the Christians according to their various sects, along with the Jews and the Zoroastrians, formed self-governing communities within the state, each under its re-

ligious head, who was responsible for seeing that order was kept and taxes were paid, and that there was no disloyalty towards the ruler. Mehmet extended this system to his empire. The head of the Orthodox communities in Ottoman territory was the patriarch of Constantinople. He should be put in charge of the *Rum Milleti*, the Orthodox nation.[5]

There was, however, no patriarch of Constantinople at the time. The last patriarch, Gregory Mammas, had favored union with Rome and found himself so unpopular that he had fled in 1451 to Italy and was generally held to have thereby abdicated. The sultan made inquiries and decided that the best man for the job would be George Scholarios, who had been the leading Aristotelian scholar of the time. He had attended the Union Council of Florence and there had supported the union with Rome, but then changed his mind and retired to a monastery under the name of Gennadios, and had become a leader of the anti-Unionists. But he could not now be found. At last it was discovered that he had been captured at the fall of the city and been sold to a rich Turk of Adrianople, who was somewhat embarrassed to find that he had acquired so learned a slave and treated him more as a friend. Gennadios was redeemed and brought before the sultan. Before he would accept the patriarchate he worked out with the sultan the constitution under which the church and the whole Orthodox *millet* were to be governed.[6]

According to the terms arranged between them, the patriarch, in conjunction with the Holy Synod, had complete control of the whole ecclesiastical establishment. It must be remembered that the patriarch had never been more than the president of the Holy Synod, which officially elected him and could by a unanimous vote depose him were he proved to be unworthy of his office or to have been elected uncanonically. In practice in Byzantine times the lay suzerain could and did nominate the candidate for the patriarchate and could press for his deposition; and the synod seldom dared to disobey the sovereign's wishes. The sultan certainly expected to exercise a similar influence, should he so wish. No bishop could be appointed or dismissed except by permission of the patriarch and the synod; but episcopal appointments had to be confirmed by the sultan, as by the emperor in previous days. The patriarchal lawcourts alone had jurisdiction over the bishops. The lay authorities could not arrest anyone of episcopal rank without patriarchal permission.

This all followed traditional lines. What was new was that the patriarch was to be in control of the Orthodox laity. He was the ethnarch, the ruler of the *millet*. He was responsible for its orderly behavior and for

ensuring that it paid its taxes. These were very heavy, in theory because non-Muslims had to pay for being excused—in fact, debarred—from being called up into the sultan's armed forces. The taxes were collected by the lay headman of the local community; and it was the duty of the church authorities to punish him if he did not do so fully and promptly. As clerics were officially excused from paying taxes, this did not make for good relations between the clergy and the laity. In fact the clergy were not wholly exempt. It was often suggested to them that they might like to make a voluntary contribution to the sultan's treasury; and it was unwise to ignore the suggestion. At the same time the patriarch could levy what taxes he pleased from his flock; and he needed large sums of money to keep his administration in working order.

Patriarchal lawcourts had for centuries dealt with cases that had a religious element, that is, not only matters of heresy and church discipline but also marriage and divorce, the guardianship of minors, testaments and successions, all according to Byzantine canon law. Now they had to take on also civil cases between members of the *millet*, according to Roman-Byzantine codified law and a growing volume of customary law. It was possible to appeal from their judgments to a Turkish court or to demand that the case be heard in the first instance before a Turkish court. But as such courts were slow, expensive, and often corrupt and judged according to Koranic law, no Christian would go before them unless he had influential Turkish friends. The patriarchal courts were generally thought to be remarkably free from corruption. Criminal cases and civil cases between a Christian and a Turk went before the Turkish courts.[7]

It is doubtful whether this constitution was ever written down. It conformed so generally with the traditional constitution for a *millet* within a Muslim state that it may have been thought unnecessary to record it. The general evidence of history makes clear that it was accepted; and we have further evidence provided by the survival of many of the *berats*, which every bishop received from the sultan on his appointment, and which stated his privileges and duties. We are told, however, of two definite documents signed by the sultan. One was a *firman* given to Gennadios, guaranteeing to the patriarch personal inviolability, exemption from paying taxes, freedom of movement, security from deposition, except by the unanimous vote of the synod, and the right to transmit these privileges to his successors. The *firman* may also have mentioned the patriarch's special right, alone among the Christians, to ride on horseback. His coreligionists all had to make do with a donkey or at best a mule.

The other document promised that the church's customs with regard to marriage and burial ceremonies should be legally sanctioned, that the Easter Feast should be officially recognized, that Christians should have freedom of movement during the three Easter feast days, and that no more churches should be converted into mosques. Unfortunately when, some seventy years later, the document was needed to halt the conversion of a church, it was found that it had perished in a fire at the patriarchate.[8]

With the constitution settled, Gennadios accepted the patriarchate. Presumably he was elected by such hierarchs as could be collected to form the Holy Synod. Then, on January 6, 1454, he was received in audience by the sultan, who handed him the insignia of his office, the robes, the pastoral staff, and the pectoral cross. The original cross had been lost, or, more probably, taken by the ex-patriarch Gregory Mammas when he fled to Italy. So Mehmet himself provided a new cross, made of silver-gilt. As he invested Gennadios he pronounced the words close to the formula used by the Christian emperors: "Be patriarch, with good fortune, and be assured of our friendship, keeping all the privileges that the patriarchs before you enjoyed." One privilege Gennadios could not enjoy. He could not be consecrated in the great church of Hagia Sophia, as it had been converted into a mosque. Instead he was taken to the second great cathedral of the city, the Church of the Holy Apostles. There he was consecrated by the metropolitan of Heraclea, whose traditional duty it was to perform the rite, and then enthroned. He emerged to mount on a fine horse, presented by the sultan, and rode in procession round the city. He returned to set up his residence and offices in the buildings attached to the church, enriched by a handsome gift of gold from the sultan.[9]

On the whole, once the horrors of the city's sack were over, the Greeks had not fared as badly as might have been expected. The Conqueror seemed to be eager to see them contented and prosperous, and to treat their church with respect. He was determined to revive Constantinople itself and for that purpose transported population there from other parts of his dominions, including large numbers of Greeks from Anatolia. Forced transportation is never pleasant; but many of these Greeks came from districts where they were surrounded and often outnumbered by unfriendly Turks. They were not sorry to come to Constantinople, where large areas were set aside for them. There they could lead their lives and conduct their crafts and businesses in some security and could worship without interference. Even in the provinces they now enjoyed better security; and in areas such as Greece itself, where the Turks were only a

thin veneer, they were probably more comfortable than they had been in the previous turbulent centuries. Moreover, with the Ottoman Empire still advancing, the Greek world was soon to be united, except for the Ionian Islands, Cyprus, and Crete, where the Venetians still held sway; and Cyprus and Crete would soon be conquered by the Turks, freeing the Greeks there from the hated domination of the Roman Church.[10]

It might have been worse. But it was not all well. The Greeks were made to realize that they were now second-class citizens. They had to wear a distinctive dress and the laity could not sport beards. In lawsuits against Turks they had little chance of success. Even a decree of the sultan that favored them might be annulled by Muslim legal authorities as being contrary to Koranic law. Still, the sultan's good will was valuable. The Conqueror, once he had eliminated their leaders, was gracious towards the Greeks. But his son and heir, Bayezit I, had grown up at a time when the intellectual greatness of Byzantium had been forgotten. He was no intellectual himself and saw the Greeks merely as a subject people, unworthy of respect. His son, Selim I, actively disliked the Christians and even thought of converting them all forcibly to Islam. When told that this was impracticable he demanded that they should at least surrender all their churches. The horrified grand vizier warned the patriarch, who, in default of documents, was able to produce two octogenarian janissaries, who swore on the Koran that they had witnessed the Conqueror receive the keys of various quarters of the captured city and promise in return that the Christians should retain their churches. Selim gave way.

The great sultan Süleyman the Magnificent, or, as the Turks called him, the Lawgiver (d. 1566), was a just and conscientious ruler who saw that the rights of the minorities were respected. But after his death rot set in from the top.[11] Few subsequent sultans were men of real ability. There were several distinguished viziers, such as the members of the Köprülü family, who were consistently fair to the minorities. But usually no one intervened if local governors or other officials chose to be oppressive. In particular, high officials and even sultans continued to convert churches into mosques, until in modern times only one Byzantine church in Constantinople, St. Mary of the Mongols, had remained in Christian hands, saved because the Conqueror himself had signed a *firman* guaranteeing its preservation, as a reward to his favorite Christian architect.[12]

Gennadios himself had been aware of the difficulties. The church of the Holy Apostles, which the sultan had allotted to him, was in a very poor condition and would be costly to restore. It was moreover placed in a

district occupied by immigrant Turks who resented its presence. Within a year he handed it over to the sultan, who pulled it down and built a mosque on the site. Gennadios then moved to the convent church of the Pammakaristos. The nuns were moved to nearby buildings, and he took over the convent building to be his residence and offices. Sultan Mehmet used to visit him there to discuss theology with him, carefully never entering the church itself, lest later Turks would use the excuse of his entry to take it over from the Christians: which was, in spite of this precaution, exactly what Sultan Murad III did in 1586. The patriarchate was obliged then to borrow the little church of St. Demetrios Kanavou from the patriarch of Alexandria, till, early in the next century, it was allowed to build its present church of St. George, with offices around it, in the Phanar quarter, then entirely inhabited by Greeks. Like all churches built under the sultans till the nineteenth century, it was not allowed to have a dome visible from outside.[13]

There were two particularly cruel burdens that the Christians had to bear. First was the practice called by the Turks the *devshirme* and by the Greeks the παιδομάζωμα, which permitted the Turks to take one boy from each Christian household and bring him up as a Muslim, to serve as a janissary, either in the armed forces or in the sultan's secretariat, or as a master craftsman, according to his ability; and naturally it was the most promising boy of the family who was taken. Occasionally the janissary remembered his Christian family and might be in a position to help it in various ways. Süleyman the Magnificent's distinguished vizier, Mehmet Sökküllü, who was by birth a Serbian Christian, used to have his Christian nephews stay with him and sometimes even accompanied them to Christian services. But such cases were rare.[14]

The second burden concerned education. The Turkish authorities discouraged Christian schools. They did not interfere with the Patriarchal Academy in Constantinople, which had had a high reputation in Palaeologan times and has survived to this day, having been periodically reformed by progressive-minded patriarchs. But attempts to found schools or academies in the provinces seldom succeeded. In Anatolia the local governors closed them down almost at once. In the European provinces, where the officials were on the whole more tolerant, they usually lasted on until some suspicious governor accused them of teaching sedition. An excellent academy was founded in Athens towards the end of the sixteenth century but was closed in about 1615, to be refounded in about 1717. It lasted, though with a diminishing reputation, throughout the eighteenth

century. There were short-lived academies at Thessaloniki, at Arta, at Nauplia, and at Yannina, and in some of the islands. An academy founded in the late seventeenth century had a high repute. Six patriarchs of the eighteenth century were educated there. Till the later seventeenth century it was possible to obtain a good theological education on Mount Athos. But then the monks turned obscurantist. When in 1753 the patriarch Cyril V tried to found an academy on the Holy Mountain, the professor whom he sent there, Evgenios Voulgaris, so shocked them by his modernist taste for German philosophy that he fled, lucky, he thought, to have escaped with his life. In the Ionian Islands, under Venetian rule, there were some good schools in Corfu and Zante. But boys from the Turkish provinces were not encouraged to go there.[15]

Venice was more helpful over higher education. A boy having some connection with a member of the Greek colony there who would finance him could go to the University of Padua, then one of the best in Europe, especially for philosophy and medicine; and no one there would try to convert him to the Roman church. The Greek hierarchy would also pay for a number of boys of humbler origin to study there. After 1577 there was also the College of Saint Athanasius at Rome, run by the Jesuits for young Greeks. It provided an excellent education. Orthodox pupils were admitted; but great pressure was put on them to go over to the Roman church. A wider choice was provided after the early eighteenth century when the Greek-born princes of Wallachia and Moldavia founded academies at the capitals of Bucharest and Jassy. These maintained high standards; but many pious Greeks found them a bit too modernistic.[16]

Perhaps the church could have done more for education. But schools are expensive to run, especially when it is necessary to bribe the authorities. Lack of money was to be the church's main problem; and it was enhanced by the Greek passion for politics, which now could only find an outlet in ecclesiastical affairs. The new responsibilities of the patriarchate involved an enlarged secretariat, to include lawyers and financiers, all of whom wanted good salaries. Soon the higher lay officials, such as the Protekdikos, the head of the judiciary, the grand logothete, the keeper of records, and the later created grand orator, the official spokesman of the church, were given places on the Holy Synod. Eminent laymen joined the episcopate in intriguing to secure such posts, which commanded prestige as well as power and often a chance of personal enrichment. The expansion of the Ottoman Empire had brought the eastern patriarchates, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, as well as the autonomous archbishoprics of Cyprus

and Sinai, under the sultan's sway; and their dealings with the central government were handled by the patriarchate of Constantinople, because it was on the spot. All this added to its labors and expenses. The patriarchate, and many of the bishoprics and monasteries, had large endowments; and the patriarch could tax them as he pleased. But there were limits to the sums that the faithful could pay. And the Turkish authorities demanded more and more in the way of bribes.[17]

This was largely due to the patriarchs themselves. Gennadios seems to have retired in 1465. His successor, Mark Xylokaravas, had only been on the throne for a few months before an ambitious prelate, Symeon of Trebizond, collected the sum of 2,000 gold pieces, which he offered to the sultan's ministers if they would order the Holy Synod to depose Mark and elect him in his stead. The sultan's Christian stepmother, the Serbian princess Mara, whom he greatly respected, heard of this and rushed to see him to get the transaction annulled. But she herself prudently brought 2,000 pieces of gold with her. Though her wishes were granted, henceforward every would-be patriarch had to produce a sum of money, generally known as the *peshkesh*, or gift, to have his candidature ratified by the sultan. Symeon managed to secure the throne a few years later, but then was outbid by a Serbian prelate, Raphael, who offered to pay in addition a yearly sum of 2,000 gold pieces to the Sublime Porte.[18] By the middle of the seventh century the *peshkesh* was usually 3,000 gold pieces, and the annual tribute roughly the same. By then the patriarch was also expected to pay a varying number of "voluntary" taxes; and he had to provide the mutton consumed by the palace guard, men of voracious appetites.[19]

It was thus to the interest of the sultan to appoint new patriarchs or to reappoint deposed patriarchs as frequently as possible. Süleyman the Magnificent was the only sultan to disapprove of this. Thanks to him the patriarch Jeremiah I enjoyed an unbroken reign of twenty-one years, by far the longest in patriarchal history. In the century from 1495 to 1595 there were nineteen patriarchal reigns. From 1595 to 1695 there were sixty-one changes on the throne, though only thirty-one individual patriarchs, as many were reappointed after deposition. Some reigns were short. Matthew II reigned for twenty days in 1595, then for four years, 1598 to 1602, then for seventeen days in 1603. Cyril I had seven different spells on the throne. His rival, Cyril II, reigned first for one week only, though later he reigned for twelve months. The climax was reached in 1726, when Calixtus III paid 5,600 gold pieces for his election and died of joy, from a sudden heart attack, the following day. After that even the Turks realized

that things had gone too far. The *peshkesh* and the annual tribute were fixed. In the century from 1695 to 1795 there were only thirty-one patriarchal reigns and twenty-three individual patriarchs. After 1765 patriarchs were forbidden to try to pay for the *peshkesh* from the revenues of the church. They had to raise the sum from their own pockets.[20]

This was just as well, because the debts of the patriarchate were steadily rising. By 1730 they were estimated at 100,769 piasters, while the annual revenue was seldom enough to pay for regular expenses. By the eve of the Greek War of Independence the debts were said to approach 1,500,000 piasters.[21] It was fortunate for the church that it had rich friends who were ready to come to its aid. The rulers of the wealthy principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia had submitted voluntarily to the sultan and so were allowed to keep their thrones under Ottoman suzerainty. They were willing now and then to help the patriarchate with its money problems. Further to the north there was the tsar of Muscovy. As he considered himself, after the fall of Byzantium, to be the head of the Orthodox Christian commonwealth, it was his duty to concern himself with the welfare of the Great Church of Constantinople. But the generosity of these potentates, though great at times, was spasmodic. In the first half of the seventeenth century Muscovy was in no position to send aid. Patrons nearer at hand were needed.[22]

An unforeseen result of the Ottoman conquest had been the rebirth of Greek mercantile life. The Italians, who had dominated the trade of the Levant in the later Middle Ages, lost their privileges, and their colonies dwindled away. Few Turks had any liking or aptitude for commerce; so trade within the large and expanding Ottoman dominions passed into the hands of their subject races, Jews, Armenians, and, above all, Greeks. Unable to indulge in their favorite pastime of politics, except as regards the church, the livelier Greeks took up commerce and banking, thus being of use to powerful Turks who did not bother themselves with such matters. Other Greeks took up doctoring, there being few Turks with any knowledge of medicine. This gave them an entry into Turkish homes.

Soon a rich class of Greeks emerged. Discretion was necessary. A Christian who showed off his wealth was liable to have it all confiscated owing to some trumped-up charge of treason or some other misdemeanor, and maybe to lose his life as well. This was the fate of the first Greek millionaire of the captivity, Michael Cantacuzenos, whom the Turks surnamed *Shaitanoglu*, the son of the Devil. In the mid-sixteenth century he acquired the monopoly of the fur trade from Russia. He lived at Anchialos,

on the Black Sea, a city that was almost entirely Greek, where his wealth would not attract Turkish envy. He was able to marry the daughter of the prince of Wallachia; and he could exercise so much influence in the church that he was able to have a worthy patriarch deposed for ruling that one of his family marriage schemes was forbidden by canon law. To gain favor with the sultan, he fitted out at his own expense sixty galleys for the Ottoman navy. Even so the sultan put him to death in 1578, appropriating and selling off his estate. Most of his magnificent library was bought by monasteries on Mount Athos.[23]

His slightly younger contemporary, John Karadja, made a vast fortune as caterer to the Ottoman army, a post in which he was succeeded by his son-in-law Scarlatos, surnamed Beglitsi, who acquired a fortune even greater than Shaitanoglu's. When he was murdered by a fanatical janissary in 1630, the bulk of his wealth was inherited by his youngest daughter, Roxandra, widowed princess of Wallachia and Moldavia. There were by now a number of rich Greek merchant and banking dynasties, based in the Phanar quarter of Constantinople, but seeking to invest their money in Wallachia and Moldavia, where alone in the Ottoman dominions lay Christians could own land. There they intermarried with the local nobility and with the ruling family of the Bassaraba, while maintaining their financial connection with Constantinople.[24]

In the mid-seventeenth century a young Chiot, trained in medicine at Padua, called Panayoti Nikoussios Mamonas and nicknamed "the green horse," from a saying that you could as easily find a green horse as a wise man from Chios, was appointed by the great Albanian-born grand vizier Ahmet Köprülü to be his family doctor. His linguistic gifts and his general ability so impressed Köprülü that in 1669 he created for him the post of grand dragoman of the Sublime Porte, that is, interpreter-in-chief and head of the secretariat in the Foreign Ministry. As such, Mamonas was allowed to grow a beard, to ride on horseback, and to wear a bonnet trimmed with fur. So well did this work that when Mamonas died in 1673, Köprülü appointed another Greek to the post.[25]

This was Alexander Mavrocordato, the son of Beglitsi's heiress Roxandra and her second husband, a Chiot who claimed descent from the Greco-Venetian family of Mavros or Moro (to which the general known to us as Othello the Moor actually belonged) and from the Greco-Genoese family of Cordato, and whose mother belonged to a branch of the old Roman family of the Massimi. Alexander had been educated first at the Greek College in Rome, without, however, becoming a Catholic convert,

then at the University of Padua, from which he was sent down for riotous behavior, then at Bologna, where he obtained a doctoral degree with a remarkable thesis on the circulation of the blood. At the age of twenty-four he was appointed grand orator of the Great Church and director of the Patriarchal Academy, while continuing his medical practice, with the sultan as one of his patients. He was thirty-one when he became grand dragoman. He held the post till 1698, apart from a few months in 1684, when he was unjustly cast into prison as a scapegoat for the Turkish failure before Vienna. In 1698 a still higher post was created for him, that of Exaporites, Keeper of the Secrets and chief secretary to the sultan, with the titles of prince and illustrious highness. He died in office in 1709.[26]

No other Greek reached such eminence in the sultan's service. But many of them in the eighteenth century were employed by the Ottoman government, profitably for themselves; and they used their positions to help fellow Greeks as well. When the native dynasty of the Bassaraba died out in the Danubian principalities, the sultan appointed Greeks from the Phanar as princes of Wallachia and Moldavia. As with the patriarchate, candidates for the posts had to pay a large bribe to secure the appointment, as well as a heavy annual tribute; and the Turks therefore made frequent changes. No princely reign was allowed to last for long. Rich though the principalities were in natural resources, few princes returned to Constantinople financially richer for their experience. Yet many of them sought the post. It carried prestige and a princely title for the family, as well as a brief enjoyment of power. It cannot be said that the princes, in their eagerness to recoup themselves, did much for their subjects, though some, such as Constantine Mavrocordato, the Exaporite's grandson, were enlightened rulers. He reformed taxation, to make it more equitable, and he planned to liberate the serfs. But the princes did a great deal for Hellenism. The academies that they founded at Bucharest and at Jassy became centers of classical learning, where the Greeks were reminded of their intellectual heritage.[27]

The Phanariots were also generous to the Church. But there their influence was not so happy. In return for their generosity they demanded for their relatives the top lay posts in the patriarchal organization and a voice in the choice of patriarch. They valued modern education and wished to modernize the church. But the church was not ready for the benefits of the eighteenth-century Enlightenment. It still produced some well-educated clerics. But standards were declining. Till the middle of the seventeenth century the monasteries of Mount Athos were still adding to

their libraries. By the end of the century the books were usually unread. Moreover the patriarchate with its political and financial troubles could no longer satisfactorily supervise the provinces. It lost touch with the faithful there. This became all too clear when in the eighteenth century the fashionable stirrings of nationalism began to affect the Greeks, especially in Greece itself. While the monks in Greece rejected the attempts of the patriarchate to improve their education, they supported rebellious movements, and even banditry, urged on by anticlerical Greeks such as Adamantios Korais, living safely in Paris.[28]

The movement for Greek independence posed terrible problems for the patriarchate. Each patriarch had on his appointment to swear allegiance to the sultan and to undertake that his flock would be loyal to the Ottoman government. Could he break his solemn oath? Besides, living in the center of things in Constantinople, he knew that though the Ottoman administration might be sinking into chaos the Ottoman army was still formidable. Every recent Christian rising, in the Peloponnese, in Cyprus, in the principalities, had been savagely put down. Could he encourage his flock to take such a risk? Would it not be better to follow the advice of the older Phanariots? They hoped to work their way further and further into the tottering Ottoman bureaucracy, so that when it collapsed they could take it over. But such an attitude was not to the liking of impatient young nationalists, even among the Phanariots and the hierarchy. When in 1821 the flag of rebellion was raised, in the principalities by a young Phanariot and in the Peloponnese by an archbishop, the fears of the patriarch, Gregory V, were justified. But he could not bring himself to denounce and excommunicate the rebels, as his Turkish masters demanded. He paid for it with his life.[29]

It is not possible in one brief article to give more than an outline of the story of the *Rum Milleti*. But I have tried to show that the Greeks in that dark period of the Tourkokratia deserve a better treatment than most historians like to give them. Despite all their difficulties, despite the unworthy behavior of many of them, they managed to keep Hellenism alive. For that the basic credit must go to the great patriarch Gennadios; and some of it, indeed, to Sultan Mehmet the Conqueror, who had no wish to see Hellenic culture perish. Subsequent sultans were less enlightened; and it must be admitted that several subsequent patriarchs were unfitted for their task. Credit must be given, too, to the much maligned Phanariots, who stimulated a renascence of Hellenism in the eighteenth century, making a far more solid contribution to it than did that overpraised

anticlerical Korais. The story of the Tourkokratia displays few obvious heroes; but it is a heroic story all the same, the story of an oppressed people who refused to lose its identity and to forget its high traditions. And it was, above all, the church that kept the light burning.

Notes

1. Joseph Gill, *The Council of Florence* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1959), 349–52, 366–68; Steven Runciman, *The Great Church in Captivity: A Study of the Patriarchate of Constantinople from the Eve of the Turkish Conquest to the Greek War of Independence* (London: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1968), 109–11; Joan M. Hussey, *The Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), 283–86.

2. Ihor Ševčenko, "Intellectual Repercussions of the Council of Florence," *Church History* 24 (1955): 291–323, esp. 296–300.

3. This theme underlies the whole of Kritovoulos's work: *History of Mehmed the Conqueror*, trans. Charles T. Riggs (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1954).

4. Franz Carl Heinrich Babinger, *Mehmed der Eroberer und seine Zeit* (Munich: F. Bruckmann, 1953), 265–69, 449–53; Steven Runciman, *The Fall of Constantinople, 1453* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1963), 55–56, 149–52, 186–87.

5. Runciman, *Great Church*, 167–68.

6. Kritovoulos, 94–95; *Historia Politica et Patriarchica Constantinopoleos; Epirotica* (Bonn, 1849), 78–80.

7. Runciman, *Great Church*, 170–72, giving references. See also the documents published in Theodore H. Papadopoullos, *Studies and Documents Relating to the History of the Greek Church and People under Turkish Domination* (Brussels: N.p., 1952).

8. Runciman, *Great Church*, 170–72.

9. *Historia Politica et Patriarchica*, 27–28, 80–82; Runciman, *Great Church*, 169–70.

10. See N[icolae] Iorga, *Byzance après Byzance: Continuation de l'"Histoire de la vie byzantine"* (Bucarest: Institut d'Etudes Byzantines, 1935), 45–56, for a general conspectus.

11. Runciman, *Great Church*, 186–91, giving references.

12. The story of the preservation of St. Mary of the Mongols is told by Demetrie Cantemir, *The History of the Growth and Decay of the Othman Empire*, trans. N. Tindal (London, 1734–35), 105.

13. Runciman, *Great Church*, 186–91; Manouel Ioannes Gedeon, *Patriarchikoi pinakes: Eideseis istorikai biographikai peri ton patriarchon Konstantinoupoleos apo Andreou tou Protokletou mechris Ioakeim G' tou apo Thess[a]lonikes*, 36–1884 (Constantinople, 1890), 530.

14. Stephan Gerlach, *Stephan Gerlachs dess aeltern Tage-buch* (Frankfurt, 1674), 88. Gerlach was the Lutheran chaplain to the Holy Roman Empire's ambassador at Constantinople and had many friends among the Orthodox ecclesiastics.

15. Runciman, *Great Church*, 208–25.

16. For the Greek colony in Venice and its educational facilities, see Deno J. Geanakoplos, *Greek Scholars in Venice* (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1962), esp. chaps. 4–6. For the College of St. Athanasius at Rome, see Martin Jugie, *Theologia dogmatica Christianorum Orientalium ab Ecclesia Catholica dissidentium*, 5 vols. (Paris: Letouzey et Ane, 1926–35), 1:522–24. For the academies in the principalities, see below, n. 27.

17. Papadopoullos, 48–50, 86–89; Iorga, 72–77.

18. *Historia Politica et Patriarchica*, 39–44, 102–15.

19. For a full discussion of the patriarchal finances see *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, s.v. "Constantinople (Eglise de)"; Runciman, *Great Church*, 200–202, with references.

20. "Constantinople (Eglise de)," listing the patriarchal reigns; Runciman, *Great Church*, 200–202.

21. Papadopoullos, 132, 160. The figure for the patriarchal debt in 1821 is given in Maxime Raybaud, *Memoires sur la Grèce, pour servir à l'histoire de la guerre de l'indépendance, accompagnés de plans topographiques* (Paris, 1824), historical introduction by A. Rabbé, 80.

22. Runciman, *Great Church*, 195–96, 322–32.

23. For Shaitanoglu, see Iorga, 114–21. The ambassador Gerlach knew him well and believed him to be the illegitimate son of an English ambassador (Gerlach, 55, 60, 223–25). M. Crusius, *Turcograeciae, libri octo* (Basle, 1584), 509, tells of the sale of his books, his informant being Gerlach.

24. Runciman, *Great Church*, 363–66.

25. Ibid., 364, with references.

26. There is no satisfactory life of the Exaporite. The fullest is to be found in Alexandre A. C. Stourdza, *L'Europe orientale et le rôle historique des Maurocordato, 1660–1830; avec un appendice contenant des actes et documents historiques et diplomatiques inédits* (Paris: Plon-Nourrit, 1913), 25–91, based on a vast number of documents, published and unpublished, but somewhat carelessly compiled. See Runciman, *Great Church*, 366–69, with other references.

27. Runciman, *Great Church*, 371–76.

28. Ibid., 392–93.

29. The most vivid account of the patriarchate on the outbreak of the Greek War of Independence is given by the English chaplain Robert Walsh, *Residence at Constantinople during a Period Including the Commencement, Progress, and Termination of the Greek and Turkish Revolutions*, 2 vols. (London, 1836), 1:299–333. He witnessed the hanging of the patriarch.

THE BYZANTINE LEGACY IN THE FORMAL CULTURE OF THE BALKAN PEOPLES

Speros Vryonis, Jr.

THE SUBJECT OF our symposium, "The Byzantine Tradition after the Fall of Constantinople," is as vast as it is important. Both the title and the subject recall another such conference, held at Dumbarton Oaks in the spring of 1968, entitled, "After the Fall of Constantinople."[1] But the years that have elapsed between the two conferences have brought a virtual revolution in our understanding and conceptualization of the period itself and of its importance. There is now much more concern with the history of the ongoing rhythms of Byzantine civilization, and a realization that the political and military events that led to the demise of the Byzantine Empire did not terminate Byzantine civilization in eastern and southeastern Europe. Indeed the older and narrower academic divisions of the disciplines, which attached decisive importance to political and military history, have collapsed before a broader understanding of human historical experience.

Although most Byzantinists today are still encapsulated in their chronological cocoons, they are slowly, often vaguely, becoming aware that Byzantium did not die on the fateful morning of May 29, 1453, and that its civilization remained a potent force in the lives, mentalities, and cultural creations of Greeks, Bulgars, Serbs, Rumanians, Albanians, and others. But a difficulty is presented by the matter of languages. All those who wish to chart or study the *Nachleben* of Byzantium in this later period must master not only the classical languages, but also a bewildering array of Balkan languages: modern Greek, Rumanian, Serbo-Croatian, Bulgarian, and eventually even Albanian; and in addition they must turn to the oriental languages: Turkish, Arabic, and, it is hoped, Persian.[2] All of these languages are rich in primary source materials, but in addition, no one can successfully pursue Byzantine or post-Byzantine studies without

reading the voluminous modern scholarship in them. One begins Byza-
tine studies by becoming a classicist and then becomes, successively, a
Slavist, Orientalist, and Neo-Hellenist.

Whereas the interest in things post-Byzantine is new to Byzantine studies in the Western hemisphere, the Balkan peoples have a long and well-developed interest in this period in their respective national histories. The postwar era has seen not only extensive and detailed monographic scholarship on the history and culture of the various inhabitants of the Balkans, but also several excellent multivolume series on the national histories, in which great attention is given to the Ottoman period and to the survival of the Byzantine tradition. The sixteen-volume Ἱστορία τοῦ ἑλληνικοῦ ἔθνους, which came out in the 1970s, dedicates two volumes (10 and 11) to what the Greeks call the *Tourkokratia*. These volumes display a very high level of scholarly sophistication and represent, in most cases, the sum total of the most recent scholarly conclusions in the realms of politics, institutions, religion, the economy, society, the arts, education, literature, and popular culture. On a similarly high level is the fourth volume of the *Istoriia na Bulgariia*, a series currently appearing under the auspices of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences. In the two-volume *Istorija Naroda Jugoslavije*, a combined effort on the part of Yugoslav scholars and their respective academies, most of the second volume summarizes the latest researches on the history of the Yugoslav peoples under Ottoman rule. Impressive also are the volumes in the *Istoria Romeniie*, which the Rumanian Academy of Sciences published after World War II. In short, no scholar can avoid consulting these massive research tools when dealing with the subject of the Byzantine legacy after the fall of Constantinople.

My own interest in this subject was stimulated by three factors. First, I could not derive from my university textbooks or teachers any satisfactory explanation of what happened to the millennial, vigorous cultural tradition of Byzantium after the establishment of the Ottoman Empire. Second, I was aware, simply from speaking modern Greek, that such fundamental words as *kaiki* (boat), *çiş* (urine), and *habaria* (news) were Turkish and not Greek; yet all three words would have been essential to the lives and societies of the ancient and Byzantine Greeks. What then was the relation of Ottoman culture to the cultures of the conquered peoples? Finally there was my interest in, and wonderment at, learning new, so-called exotic, languages. Having begun in classical history and literature, I had moved through the curriculum of Byzantine studies and then realized that in order to come to grips with these fundamental questions I had to

become familiar with Balkan and oriental languages, and that only then could I begin to probe the nature of Byzantine culture and the extent of its survival after 1453.

I have turned to this last question in three articles over the past twenty years, in which I have tried to work out for myself the answers to questions related to the degree of survival and the form of the Byzantine legacy during the Tourkokratia. In the first essay I attempted to discern the boundaries between Byzantine and Ottoman cultural institutions.[3] Therein I concluded that the inextricable union of religion and the state in the Middle Ages, and indeed in early modern times for the geographical area in question, determined that the formal aspect of Turkish society would be Muslim: sultanate, bureaucracy, "church," literature, and a great deal of the art. Conversely the *basileia* and Orthodoxy had determined the formal institutions of Byzantine society, and so the influence of Byzantine formal culture could only follow the large-scale adoption of the Byzantine style of theocracy, as occurred in Serbia and Bulgaria, and to a lesser degree in Russia and Rumania. At a second level, however, it was obvious that Ottoman folk culture was profoundly influenced, and in some cases was even determined, by that of Byzantium. At the same time, Ottoman institutions reduced much of Byzantine culture to the level of popular culture. I concluded this first study as follows: "The effect of Turkish forms on the Byzantine legacy was decapitation on the formal level and isolation on the folk level."

A few years later I attempted to analyze the historico-cultural experience of one Balkan people, the Greeks, under Turkish rule.[4] I concluded that the Tourkokratia constituted one of the major periods of Greek historical experience and that Turkish rule brought eight far-reaching developments in the culture and society of the Greeks: political disenfranchisement, the simplification of class structure, economic impoverishment, ethnic dilution, religious retreat, legal disenfranchisement, the popularization or deformalization of culture, and cultural isolation.

Most recently, in the conference "The Byzantine Legacy in Eastern Europe, 1500 to the Twentieth Century," in which a panel of speakers dealt with the *Nachleben* of Byzantium in formal rather than in popular culture, I returned to the general subject with a communique entitled "The Byzantine Legacy in Folk Life and Tradition in the Balkans."[5] In this third incursion into later Byzantine culture I returned to an analytical categorization that I had always found useful in examining Greek historical experience—namely, the separation of the popular and formal elements in cul-

ture. This distinction has proved extremely convenient in my efforts to understand the processes that affect continuity and change in Greek culture throughout its four millennia of identified existence.

In this third essay I began by pointing to the different approaches of two great scholars, Nicolae Iorga and Phaidon Koukoules. The former, in attempting to trace the survival of Byzantine culture after 1453, found it in a relatively small number of ghost institutions. Koukoules, on the other hand, traced the rhythms of cultural survival in popular institutions and accordingly found it necessary to write eight volumes, whereas Iorga found that he could cover his own subject in one thin volume. I posited as a heuristic device the existence of horizontal layers of popular culture among the various Balkan peoples, together with a vertical structure of historical events and processes placed one layer atop another. Further, given the fact that folklore studies, or I should say studies of the popular culture, of the Balkan peoples are well developed in the Balkans, I employed a comparative approach by examining Greeks, Bulgars, Serbs, and Turks. Six topics were studied: Byzantine Constantinople and Turkish Istanbul; religion, or man's relation to others and to the unknown; the agrarian and pastoral cycles and calendars; the *panegyris*, or festival; and the popular legend of Alexander the Great. This comparison revealed a profound continuity of the Byzantine legacy in the popular culture of the Balkans and underlined the fact that despite great linguistic and ethnic variety, this popular culture had a pronouncedly Byzantine spinal cord.

In the present essay I wish to turn to the second facet of the general problem of the fate of the Byzantine legacy, that of the formal culture of the Balkan peoples under Ottoman rule. This is a far more complex phenomenon than the Byzantine legacy in the popular culture of the Balkans. First, the nature of the Ottoman conquest was such that it largely, but not completely, destroyed the Balkan dynasties and aristocracies, the very patrons of Byzantine formal culture. Second, the primary beneficiaries of the new political order were the Muslims and their society, so that it was their formal cultural institutions that now gained from the wealth of the land. One need look only at the splendid network of mosques, medresses, hospitals, imarets, libraries, and palaces with which the Ottoman ruling class adorned the Balkan peninsula.[6] Third, the urban centers were, to varying degrees, converted to Islamic rhythms of social and cultural life.[7] Thus the Byzantine legacy in the formal culture of the Balkan peoples was truncated, and often led a strange half-life. Finally, we are dealing with a large area, one that displayed a certain regional variety, and

with a period that endured for over four hundred years, with the life and culture of the Christians undergoing a fundamental change in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Because my subject is vast I shall restrict myself to a few topics: law, the religious calendar, religious painting, Mount Athos, and literature.

Law

Byzantium, as the conscious heir of Rome and unconscious heir of the Hellenistic kingdoms and ancient Greece, had a very elaborate legal system, which was divided on the one hand between secular law and canon law, and on the other between formal legal codes and acknowledged customary law. The diffusion of Byzantine legal codes, customary law, and practices, particularly to the Syriac Christians and medieval Bulgars, Serbs, and Rumanians, has long been the subject of investigation. The closer the medieval Balkan states drew to Byzantine civilization, the more did their legal structures reflect the influences of Byzantine law. The shock of the political decapitation of these medieval states at the hands of the Ottoman conquerors undoubtedly relaxed the hold of the Byzantine legal system.

I should like to begin by underlining the importance of the land and the sea in Byzantine legal codes and customary law. The economic exploitation of the land and sea lay at the basis of Byzantine economic life and accordingly the emperors were constantly exercised to regulate it, in works as early as the *Digest* and the *Novels* of Justinian,[8] and then through their various reworkings, until the abridgments of Armenopoulos and Vlastares.[9] Perhaps the two most spectacular bodies of law that deal with the regulations on land and sea are the agrarian laws of the Macedonians and the Rhodian Sea Law.[10] I shall examine certain provisions from each and try to trace their history during the Ottoman period. This will give us the opportunity to look at the question of legal survivals in very important areas.

Protimesis and *Protime*

In the extraordinary corpus of Macedonian agrarian legislation dedicated to blocking the land expansion of the magnates, the tenth-century emperors attempted to protect the fiscal, social, and territorial integrity of the free peasant village by restricting land purchases and exchanges among peasants, relatives, and neighbors. Utilizing a much older principle known

as *protimesis* (προτίμησις), or preemption, this body of legislation, as is well known, established an elaborate, calibrated hierarchy of peasants who had preemptive rights in the purchase of peasant lands and farms. The peasants' right to exercise this preemptive purchase, granted first to relatives and then to neighbors, was known in the Byzantine texts as *protimesis*.[11]

By the eleventh century the efforts of the central government to halt the inroads of the wealthy into peasant lands through the application of *protimesis* had largely failed. But the later Byzantine legal compendia retain a clear understanding of the nature of *protimesis* and either quote or give the contents of some of this Macedonian legislation, especially the law of Romanus I, and occasionally that of Constantine VII. Such are the decisions of Demetrios Chomatianos, the *Procheiron Auctum* (ca. 1300), and the *Hexabiblos* of Armenopoulos (1345). Although these texts indicate a clear knowledge of the fact that the Macedonians had promulgated these laws to halt the depredations of the aristocracy at the expense of the peasantry, the laws were no longer applied with this socio-political aim in mind. That some aspects of *protimesis* were still being applied in late Byzantium emerges from two documents of sale dated 1375 and 1392, where an individual exercises a protimetic right to buy property on the basis of being a neighbor.[12]

We know that the texts and vernacular Greek paraphrases of Armenopoulos and Vlastares circulated in Greek lands under Ottoman rule. Indeed the *Nomokriterion* of the seventeenth century, composed in vernacular Greek, covers the subject of *protimesis* in chapters 53 and 55, and refers to the *Novels* of Romanus I and Manuel I (?) on the subject.[13] What does this all mean? Was *protimesis* still a living legal principle regulating the sale of land in the Ottoman Empire?

The answer to this question is to be ascertained by analyzing two bodies of documents, the so-called insular constitutions and the notarial records. Recently I analyzed and translated a large number of these constitutions, which describe the law and custom that were proclaimed by the local governments of Mykonos (1647), Syros (1695, 1700, 1812), Poros (1829), Santorini (1797), and Pholegandros (1808) under Ottoman rule and which refer to a legal institution and practice known as *protime* (προτιμή).[14] These constitutions vary in length on this matter, and often differ on specifics; but they agree in proclaiming one unifying principle in the sale of property. This is the principle that whatever the cause for the sale (except in the case of monastic property), an entire category of preferred

persons has prior rights to purchase. These documents vary in their definitions of the "preferred" persons. The *Tarifa* of Mykonos of 1647 simply differentiates between relatives and strangers.[15] In 1695 the constitution of Syros refers to persons who have protimetic rights in the purchase of property but does not describe them, whereas in 1812 it identifies them as "close relatives."[16] The authorities of Poros refer to them as consisting of, in descending order, brothers, relatives, neighbors, and finally any citizen, whether local or not. Santorini and Pholegandros provide the most specific definition of preferred purchasers, identifying them as the first relatives, from the most immediate down through the first cousins and their children (second cousins and their children are not included), and then neighbors.[17]

The rights of the preferred purchasers differ from island to island, often in regard to the statute of limitations within which the right of preemption had to be exercised. In the case of property sold at public auction, the constitutions of Syros (1695, 1812) provide that the preferred residents on the island itself have a period of ten days in which to exercise their option to purchase, whereas in Santorini (1797) they have but three days.[18] The island of Poros provides a general, nonspecified period of six months for the preferred to appear and make their claims.[19] In cases of sale other than by public auction Santorini provides a fifteen-year period for those who are abroad to return and to claim their rights.[20] On Pholegandros the period is only five years.[21]

Extremely important was the seizure of property for debt and its sale at public auction to pay the debt. This is particularly important in the case of a citizen's failure or inability to pay the sultanic tax of the *haradj*, as well as other taxes. In such cases the rule of preemptive purchase was always upheld and enforced (Mykonos, Syros).[22]

The constitution of Santorini underlines a most important principle that lies at the basis of land sale and of land confiscation by the authorities. This states that the ownership of the land is inviolably yoked to the payment of the *haradj* and other imperial taxes to the sultan. So long as an islander remained domiciled abroad, the authorities of Santorini removed him and his immediate family from the category of the "preferred" purchasers.[23]

These references to *protime* in the constitutions of the Cyclades are a striking proof of the continuity of the Byzantine legal practice and concept of *protimesis* in the legal codes and custom of these small islands. Particularly notable is the occasional application of *protime* when the insular

authorities confiscate the property of delinquent taxpayers and then sell these lands, along with their tax obligations, to the preferred category of preemptive purchasers, either at public auction or otherwise. This recalls the oldest Byzantine practices and legal forms, which associated land ownership with taxes and with preemptive purchase.

Remarkable as they are, our samples are from a restricted group of small islands. Do these constitutional provisions represent a freak, isolated survival, or are they part of a general pattern? And were they actually implemented?

Here one must turn to the notarial archives. Petropoulos has edited several thousand of these documents from Mykonos, Siphnos, and elsewhere. I have chosen one of them, at random, which deals with the institution of *protime:* it is dated September 14, 1666, and is from Mykonos.

> "In praise of Christ, Amen, September 14, 1666. Today Kera Kourtesa appeared in the office of the chancellery and says that her first husband, the late Georges as he was called, had a piece of land bought from Nikolos Delatolas for 24 reals, as appears in the document of this same first purchase recorded in 1649. Today the son of Ioannes Papagiakoumos came from Chios [and asserted] that the above property was dowry of his aunt by the name of Annousa, daughter of the late George Papagiakoumos. Since this son was absent at the time that the above property, which is located in the land called Demetrakes, was sold, coming today he "contradicted" [the sale] as [being] the closest relative and the nephew of the above Annousa. And he took the property by giving the above payment of the 24 kurush. In this [matter] the above Kera Kourtesa is taken [i.e., bought out] and she acknowledges that she received the payment of 24 kurush and that the property belongs to the above Giannoules in the future. For confirmation of the truth the summoned witnesses sign—George Santorineos witness. Antones Tzeretanos witness. Papagerasimos Vidos chancellor of Mykonos."[24]

The young man Giannoules was able to invalidate the sale of his aunt's property some seventeen years later on the grounds of preemptive rights—*protime*. The practice of *protime* in the Tourkokratia was thus directly modeled on and descended from Byzantine legal practice. We see it in documents from not only Mykonos but also such islands as Patmos,

Syros, Hydra, Naxos, Melos, and Nisyros. Further it has been recorded in the Peloponnesian towns of Gargalianoi, Kyparissia, and Philiatra. Kampouroglou noted it in Ottoman Athens as well.[25] But all of these citations come from territories under Ottoman control, and there are enough cases of its invocation in tax-related matters to suggest that *protime* may have been preserved or reinstituted by the Ottoman authorities to safeguard their fiscal interests.

That this was not the case, however, emerges from an examination of the partially published notarial documents from Cephallenia and Paxoi, islands in the Ionian Sea that escaped Ottoman rule and were governed for centuries by the Venetians. Here too the principle of *protime* in the purchase of property appears to be the established legal practice.[26] We may conclude that the *protime* mentioned so copiously in the insular constitutions and in the notarial documents of regions under both Ottoman and Venetian rule constituted a Panhellenic legal phenomenon that enjoyed an uninterrupted life from the earliest Byzantine times until its formal abrogation by the modern Greek kingdom in the mid-nineteenth century.

I have not yet inquired further into the diffusion of this Byzantine legal concept and practice outside the Byzantine homelands. It was, however, introduced into the legal systems and agrarian practices of the Danubian principalities in the seventeenth century as the result of the influx of Greek influences.[27] The lack of complete uniformity in the actual exercise of the preemptive rights of purchase in the Greek-speaking lands that we have examined must originate in the destruction of the centralized Greek political authority, which gave ample opportunity for the development of local variations.

Maritime Law of Byzantium and of the Tourkokratia

Just as the disposition of the land remained crucial to the everyday life of the Balkan Christians under Ottoman rule, so the regulation of sea exploitation remained particularly important for the Greeks, who continued to be the Balkan seafarers par excellence during the Tourkokratia. As in the case of *protime*, the matter of maritime law is richly illustrated by the insular constitutions and the notarial archives, and it is to these that I once more turn to make sondages regarding the possible survival of Byzantine legal forms. The Justinianic *Digest*, the *Basilica*, the later legal handbooks, but above all the Rhodian Sea Law provide considerable material for establishing the legal base of maritime regulations in the period before

1453; and these documents, when taken together with the insular constitutions and notarial archives, make it possible to discern the patterns of survival of Byzantine maritime regulations in the Ottoman period. Having completed a lengthy discussion of this matter in a recent work, I shall refer only to its conclusions here.[28]

In the later Greek customary law dealing with the sea we observe the following:

(1) Most remarkably, the captain and the crew share in both the profits and loss of a commercial voyage.[29]

(2) When only the capital and interest are attained at the completion of a voyage, the crew is entitled to a portion of the interest.[30]

(3) When the capital is either lost or diminished the creditors lose their interest, and the captain and ship (crew?) must contribute to the full restoration of the capital.[31]

(4) Maritime loans differ from land loans in that they are not fully and completely secure. They are valid maritime loans when they finance a maritime commercial venture and there is a maritime risk involved, that is, "rizigo maritimo." Thus it is possible for the lender/venturer to suffer damage to his investment while being entitled to a higher rate of interest (usually, but not always, 20%) if the voyage is successful.[32]

(5) For the maritime loan to be fully collectible there must be a safe journey and return of the ship, a fact stated explicitly in the notarial records but also implied in the insular constitutions.[33]

(6) Commercial journeys that are disrupted or in which the ship is damaged or destroyed by storms or by piratical or foreign ships do not fit into the above category (no. 5), and so the responsibility of the captain and crew is either negated or diminished.[34]

(7) Aside from their share as participants, members of the crew can also invest capital (*βλυσίδια*) in a commercial voyage.[35]

(8) If a ship is wrecked and its goods are scattered, both ship and goods remain the property of the original owner(s). This interesting fact, not mentioned in the surviving insular constitutions, appears in the notarial notices, again illustrating the inadequate and incomprehensive nature of those written constitutions.[36]

(9) Notarial documents indicate that the jettisoning of cargo during storms, necessary for saving the crew and ship, mitigates the responsibility of captain and crew for the attendant loss.[37]

These nine provisions in later Greek maritime custom and law are in effect also found in the Rhodian Sea Law and in other Byzantine legal

documents. In the Rhodian Sea Law the captain and crew share in the profit, just as they do in post-Byzantine maritime custom: "A master's pay two shares; a steersman's one share and a half; a master's mate's share one share and a half; a carpenter's one share and a half; a boatswain's one share and a half; a sailor's one share; a cook's half a share."[38] As for the loss, the constitution of Hydra (1793) ordains, "Where there is a loss, each member of the crew and [each] companion shall pay in proportion to that which he takes, again because it coincides with their share. Similarly they shall contribute toward the loss a sum commensurate with their share."[39] The Rhodian Sea Law has a similar provision: "If there is an agreement for sharing in gain, after everything on board ship and the ship itself have been brought into contribution, let every man be liable for the loss which has occurred in proportion to his share of gain."[40]

The Rhodian Sea Law distinguishes markedly, as does the later Greek customary law of the sea, between maritime and other types of loan: "The law ordains: let them not write moneys lent at sea to be repaid out of property on land without risk. If they do write them, let them be invalid under the Rhodian Law."[41] This difference is reiterated: "Captains and merchants, those among them who borrow money on the security of ship and freight and cargo, are not to borrow it as if it were a land loan . . . let them pay back the loan from the property on land with maritime interest."[42]

Full repayment of the maritime loan depends on a successful termination of the sale of goods and safe return to the home port, and this is so in both the Rhodian Sea Law and the later customary law.[43] Damage or destruction to vessel or cargo that is not the fault of the captain and crew either negates or diminishes their fiscal responsibility.[44]

The reference to capital investment (*βλυσίδια*) by sailors in post-Byzantine maritime custom[45] seems to be referred to in the Byzantine legal code of the *Basilica*: "The captain is not responsible for the commercial exchanges of the sailors."[46] This provision is repeated in the *Hexabiblos* of Armenopoulos.[47]

As in later customary law of the sea wherein wrecked ships and goods remain the property of their original owners, so in Byzantine times they remain in the possession of their original holders. "Goods taken from a shipwreck or from jettison cannot become [someone else's] property by the passage of time. For they are not unowned."[48] The *Basilica* condemns those who take such goods: "He who takes away the jettisoned goods from the ships is guilty of theft."[49]

This brief comparison of provisions in Byzantine and post-Byzantine maritime law and custom proves, beyond any doubt, a very strong continuity in the regulation of the sea. Although there is undoubtedly some immixture from Italiote practices, as one sees from the *termini technici*, much of the legal structure of maritime regulation is of Byzantine origin. Particularly striking is the fact that captain and crew share in the profit and loss, a condition that did not exist in Venetian maritime ventures.

This concludes the investigation of the continuity in agrarian and maritime law from Byzantine into Ottoman times. The fact that such Byzantine concepts as the *protimesis/protime* and that of the sharing of the profits and losses by captain and crew not only survived but remained Panhellenic phenomena during the Tourkokratia indicates how indebted to Byzantine law were the later ages. The law of *protime* was not abolished until 1856, and the local Greek maritime codes remained vital until they were replaced by the French codes in the later eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. This corroborates an observation holding true for almost every aspect of the cultural domain—namely, that many Byzantine institutions and practices survived the Ottoman period only to succumb to Western influences.

The Seasonal and Religious Calendar

More recently I have examined the seasonal and religious calendar of the Serbs, Bulgars, and Greeks as a device contributing to the perpetuation of their popular culture and incorporating many elements from the pre-Christian popular religious culture of the Balkans.[50] By way of example it was shown how the celebrations of the feast days of the Prophet Elijah (July 20), St. George (April 23–24), and St. Tryphon (February 1) were something more than the commemoration of these saints. The celebration of the Prophet Elijah, which usually took place on mountaintops or other high locales, was associated with divination, with the sacrifice of a rooster, and with thunder, one of the attributes of Zeus.[51] The feasts of St. George and St. Tryphon coincided with important events in the pastoral and agricultural cycle. In the case of the former a young lamb was sacrificed, and the pastoral celebrants partook of a communal meal and conducted magical practices associated with the assurance of healthy flocks.[52] On the feast of St. Tryphon the peasants went to the fields to prune the vines, drink wine, and eat kollyva (κόλλυβα: boiled wheat).[53] These and other annual events indicate a considerable pagan underpinning in the life of the Orthodox Christians of the Balkans.

In the broader sense, however, the calendar is a complex and highly organized routine of seasonal life, formulated by the church. As such it was the ultimate programming of the life of the Balkan Christians, and since it was sanctioned by church and state it became the official axis of social life. This finished seasonal and religious timetable was the creation of Byzantium. It survived the Ottoman conquest and rule virtually unchanged, ensuring the continued cultural homogeneity of the Orthodox Christians and providing them with another strong tie to Byzantine (and indirectly to pagan) culture. Among the feasts that it marked, in addition to those already mentioned, were Christmas and the Duodecameron; thereafter the viticultural feast of St. Tryphon, the great carnival inaugurating the Lenten season and thus combining pagan seasonal and Christian celebrations; Easter, the Sunday of the Rosalia; the leaping over fires on June 24 (day of St. John the Baptist); the Feast of the Dormition on August 15; and All Saints on November 1, when meals for the returning souls were placed on the tombs of the departed. This seasonal calendar gave the Balkan Orthodox Christians one of the most striking institutions of cultural homogeneity and continuity. A calendrical system is much like a standard of measurement: it is primary in the cultural orientation of any society. In a sense a culture is its calendar, and vice-versa.[54] The calendar of the Orthodox Church may be reckoned among the most important manifestations of Byzantine formal culture, and it endured long after the Byzantine state had disappeared and the church had been reduced to inferior and impoverished status.

Traditions of Byzantine Painting and the *Ermeneia tes zographikes technes* of Dionysios of Fourna

The formal tradition of Byzantine painting in the Ottoman period has increasingly drawn the attention of art historians. One may refer to the late Andreas Xyngopoulos and to Manolis Chatzidakis, whose writings have established the broad lines of artistic development between the fall of Constantinople and the final victory of Western painting in the nineteenth century.[55] The tradition's variations in Serbia, Bulgaria, and Rumania have also attracted more study. Authorities have traced the life of the Cretan school, which, beginning as one of the two major currents in late Byzantine painting, culminated in the works of Theophanes the Cretan and certain of his compatriots. In the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries Crete saw the rise of a Greco-Venetian aristocracy and middle class, which patronized this art and so contributed to its flourishing. The

Byzantine traditions continued to be pursued even as Italian styles and taste began to intrude into both style and iconography. The final conquest of Crete in 1669 destroyed the socioeconomic basis and patronage of this art; the Cretan school declined, and many Cretans sought refuge and work in the Ionian Islands, which remained Venetian possessions until the destruction of the Venetian Republic at the end of the eighteenth century. The Cretan tradition, with its refined style and rich colors, was preserved until a comparatively late period in the Ionian churches. But it remained largely a regional phenomenon, as the Ionian Islands had neither the wealth nor the social prominence to project it beyond their own narrow confines.

In the eighteenth century, however, the economic conditions of the Greek mainland and islands improved considerably, bringing a revival in the building of provincial churches and an attendant increase in the need for painters to decorate them. Chatzidakis has pointed out that we know of more than 750 Greek painters active in the eighteenth century, two and one-half times the number known for the previous century, and that the numbers for the second half of the eighteenth century are four times greater than those for the first half.[56] This sudden rise in the number of painters, most of whom were of rural origin, meant a certain decline in the quality of the art. Further, noticeably more details from contemporary everyday life are evident in the paintings.

The early eighteenth century is witness to two distinct tendencies within this upsurge of painting, tendencies represented in the writings of two contemporary painters. The first is the *Ἑρμηνεία τῆς ζωγραφικῆς τέχνης*, written between 1728 and 1733 by the monk and painter Dionysios "*ὁ ἐκ Φουρνᾶ*," on Mount Athos, and the second is the work *Περὶ ζωγραφίας*, by Panayiotes Doxaras, written on the Ionian Islands in 1726. The history of these two works is the history of a bifurcation in Greek culture in Turkish times. The Greeks were torn between the old, authorized Byzantine culture and the new, revolutionary cultures of the Italian Renaissance, Baroque, and Enlightenment. Dionysios urged a return to the pure Byzantine forms and subjects of Manuel Panselinos, while Doxaras instructed his readers on how to paint in the manner of Veronese. To add insult to injury, Doxaras also translated into Greek Leonardo da Vinci's treatise on painting.

Of concern to us here is the decision of Dionysios to codify painting as it had been practiced by the Byzantines. What is noteworthy is the intentional archaism of his views: whoever wishes to paint should return

(claims Dionysios) to the norms of the fourteenth-century painter Panselinos. Even if the manner of painting he attributed to Panselinos was not still practiced, the Byzantine artistic legacy was everywhere to be seen, and Dionysios found his models in churches, in which were preserved a variety of styles and subjects. Further, the very practice of utilizing painters' handbooks was a tradition known to Dionysios from the earlier manuscripts that he used in composing his own. Thus after the eclipse of the Cretan school in the seventeenth century, just when much Orthodox art was being subjected to popularization or Westernization, we see in the writings of this monk an insistence on a return to the traditions of Byzantine painting.

Dionysios's manual is of great interest to the art historian, inasmuch as it instructs the student on the preparation of paints, gypsum, wood, plaster, and other materials, as well as on the iconography of individual scenes, their arrangement in the various types of churches, the proportions of the body, and other matters. But this is a domain which, though of interest to me, I must leave to art historians to analyze. Here I propose, first, to examine the text for indications of Byzantine inspiration, and then to describe briefly the dispersal of the text throughout the Balkans.

From the first invocation to the Virgin Mary to the last section, which gives the epigrams proper to certain iconographic subjects, Dionysios's *Ermeneia* is committed to maintaining the tradition of Byzantine painting, which he treats as a sacred art.[57] The *Ermeneia* begins with three prologues and is then organized as follows. Part One deals with such technical matters as how to copy paintings and how to prepare the materials used in painting. In Part Two Dionysios describes how to illustrate over one hundred events in the Old Testament, and in Part Three he describes the Gospel illustrations. Part Four is devoted to depictions of the parables, the Divine Liturgy, the psalms, and the Apocalypse; Part Five to the festivals of the Virgin, the apostles, saints, ecumenical councils, and martyrs; and the sixth and final part to miscellanea.

The *Ermeneia* is thus intended to be a comprehensive guidebook. But the author acknowledges that he has had access to older manuals, and Papadopoulos-Kerameus has identified and published five of these. None seems to go back further than the sixteenth century.[58] Dionysios states not only that he relied on older guides, but that he went about to various churches, studying the paintings of Panselinos himself. Undoubtedly he also incorporated oral tradition, as well as knowledge gained from his personal experience in working with or under various painters.

Thus Dionysios's *Ermeneia* is very strongly retrospective. In his second prologue Dionysios cites Panselinos but also the Cretan painters, thereby placing himself consciously in the mainstream of late Byzantine and post-Byzantine art. Indeed the first of the earlier manuals, which Papadopoulos-Kerameus has identified as one of Dionysios's primary sources, is entitled *Ermeneia of the Painter's Art, Containing the Proportions and Colors of Panselinos and of "Naturale," and the Flesh Tones of Theophanes, and Certain Other Matters Useful for This Art.*[59] Clearly Dionysios chose to go back to the traditions of Byzantium at a time (ca. 1730) when the Cretan school had collapsed and painting had been diverted from its source.

This Byzantine inspiration and spirit are reflected in two of the prologues he composed for his work. In the first, addressed to painters' apprentices, he resorts to Scripture to justify his book and to stress the sacred nature of the art:

> Heeding, O apprentices of the toil-loving painters, who are eager for learning, the Lord in the holy Gospel, wherein he condemned the one who hid the talent and said to him, "O evil and idle slave, you should have entrusted my silver to the bankers, so that on my return I would have received it with interest," I feared lest I too be condemned as lazy. Thus I was stirred to increase this small talent that was entrusted to me by the Lord, that is, this my meager art, which I learned with great effort and time, from childhood, by imitating, to the degree that I could, Kyr Manuel Panselinos of Thessaloniki, who shone like the moon, and the holy icons and beautiful churches which he painted on the holy-named mountain of Athos. And he who once shone in this art of painting like the golden, shining and moving moon, surpassed and eclipsed with his wondrous art all the ancient and modern painters, as his paintings on icons and walls most clearly demonstrate. And anyone who in any way participates in [the art of] painting will comprehend this clearly when he sees and studies these [paintings] carefully.
>
> And it is his art—which, as I said, I learned with great labor from childhood—which I desired, with all my will, to increase on behalf of you my fellow artists, interpreting this [art] in the present book, recording all his measures and forms, flesh tones and colors, with all accuracy.[60]

His justification for writing the book is thus scriptural. The third and last prologue, entitled, "Preliminary Training and Instruction for Him Who Wishes to Learn the Painter's Art," is thoroughly Byzantine in character. He first sets out the stages through which the apprentice must progress, almost as if he were describing the procedures of a Byzantine guild:

> Let him who wishes to learn the painter's art be introduced first to the fundamentals, and let him carry out exercises of a simple nature, without drawing proportions, so that he may show himself prepared. And then let there be carried out on his behalf the prayer to Jesus Christ and the petition before the icon of the Theotokos Hodegetria. Giving the blessing, the priest, after [having recited the prayers] the "Heavenly King," and so on, the megalynarion [short hymn] of the Theotokos, "The lips are speechless," and the troparion of the Metamorphosis, and having signed his [the apprentice's] forehead with the cross, should say aloud, "Let us beseech the Lord." The prayer:
>
> "O Lord Jesus Christ our God, who is uncircumscribed by nature of his divinity and who, for the ultimate salvation of man, was incomprehensibly made flesh through the Virgin Mary Theotokos and deigned to be circumscribed; You who impressed the holy features of your immaculate face on the holy towel, with which you healed the illness of the toparch Abgar and enlightened his soul in the knowledge of you our true God; You who through your Holy Spirit brought understanding to your divine apostle and evangelist Luke, [enabling him] to draw the form of your blameless mother holding you as an infant. . . . Do you, Lord God of all, enlighten and bring understanding to the soul, the heart and the mind of your servant ——— and guide his hands so that he may draw without blame and superbly the form of your likeness and of your most immaculate mother and of all your saints; for your glory and for the brilliance and beautification of your holy Church and for the remission of the sins of those who accord them [the images] relative veneration and embrace them with piety and send up honor to the prototype. Save him [the apprentice] from every diabolical influence so that he will progress in all your commands by the intercessions of your most immaculate mother, of the holy and glorious apostle and evangelist Luke, and of all the saints, Amen."[61]

Only after the initial period of teaching and the religious ceremony is the apprentice to be taught proportions and forms. Dionysios exhorts the neophyte:

> Know, therefore, O eager pupil, that when you desire to undertake this science [ἐπιστήμην] you must search to find some competent teacher, whom quickly you must evaluate to see whether he will teach you as I have indicated. But if you should happen upon someone who is ignorant and artless, do you then just as we did, and look to find some archetypes by the famous Manuel Panselinos, and labor over them, drawing in the manner that we shall explain to you further on, until you comprehend his proportions and forms. Next go to a church that he has painted so that you can make copies in the manner that we shall explain to you. Take care not to work simply and in any which way, but with the fear of God and with piety, for the labor is sacred. Take care when you have removed the copy, whether from the wall or icon, to wash well the original with a clean sponge, to clean all the black [which you have left], for if you do not clean it immediately and the black remains atop [the painting] and later can no longer be cleaned, you will thus fall into the crime of impiety and be condemned as a despiser of the icons, since, as the great [St.] Basil has said that the honor of the icon proceeds to the prototype, so also the reverse. I give this small advice and order to you, O friend, in godly love and true brotherly regard, in fear of the [last] judgment. For I also found in many places where the painters had raised copies, that, I know not whether from ignorance or from impiety and without fear of judgment, they did not clean the icons immediately but left them blackened. And these I tried in every way to clean and to wash but was not able. If the icon from which you wish to take a copy happens to be ancient and the strokes are not clear, or the gypsum is feeble and you are afraid to wash it lest you destroy it, do as follows: First, wash it carefully, then repair it and coat it with varnish, then make the copy, and after that wash it again just as I have explained to you.[62]

Toward the end of this prologue Dionysios exhorts the reader to learn the art with great care and diligence, "for this labor is divine [θεῖον] and descended from God [θεοπαράδοτον]. And this is clear to all from many other signs, but particularly from the *acheiropoietos* [not-made-by-

hand] and revered icon which He himself the God-man Jesus Christ, having wiped His all holy face, sent to the toparch of Edessa Abgar [as] the imprint of His divine image on the holy towel."[63]

Not only is the art of the painter divine, but it was praised by the Mother of Christ herself when "she prayed on behalf of and blessed the holy apostle and evangelist Luke for this art."[64] Further, that the art is blessed is evident "also from the countless miracles which the icons of Christ and the Mother of God and of the remaining saints have performed and still perform."[65] Because of this all those who labor piously and carefully receive God's grace and blessings. But all who labor impiously and carelessly, being greedy out of love of money, let them have a care and let them repent before the end, calling to mind . . . the punishment in the fire of hell."[66]

The author describes a system of teachers and apprentices, as well as a graduated, simple system of instruction involving a religious ceremony. All of this recalls the system of apprenticeship in the guild of the *taboullarioi* described in the tenth-century *Book of the Eparch*, where also the candidate, before his induction, goes to church for the appropriate ceremony. Dionysios cites a special relation between the painter and Christ, the Virgin, and St. Luke, thus giving religious sanction to the art and the system of training. Also imbued with religious significance, for Dionysios, is the copying of paintings. He says that any damage inflicted on an older icon during the making of a copy subjects the painter to the charge of criminal impiety. Here Dionysios employs a corollary of the idea, used by St. John of Damascus, that the reverence paid to an image passes through the image to the prototype. Dionysios knew well the christological basis of Byzantine painting as defined by the Seventh Ecumenical Council, and he invokes it by referring to Christ as "uncircumscribed by nature of his divinity and . . . incomprehensibly made flesh through the Virgin Mary Theotokos and . . . thus [he] deigned to be depicted, for the ultimate salvation of man."

With these remarks I complete my analysis of the Byzantine inspiration and character of the *Ermeneia*. It remains to discuss the diffusion of the text to the other Balkan peoples. The Rumanian scholar Vasile Grecu has studied the diffusion and translation of the text and has edited the translation into Rumanian by the cleric Macarie (which dates to 1805).[67] Bulgarian translations also began to appear in the nineteenth century, although in some cases the possibility of the mediation of a Russian translation has been raised.[68] As Dionysios's *Ermeneia* was intended to be

a practical handbook, there was no canonization of the text, and therefore some Bulgarian *Ermenii* do not reproduce exactly the contents, details and order of the Greek text. It is interesting, however, that these manuals bear, in Bulgarian, the Greek title of *Ermenii*.

Athos

The text of Dionysios's *Ermeneia* and its emanation from eighteenth-century Mount Athos to the Orthodox peoples of the Balkans, Asia Minor and Russia, brings to our attention one of the most important sources of Byzantine influence on the formal culture of the Balkan peoples. This is, of course, Mount Athos, with its rich and living Byzantine traditions and its Greek, Serbian, Bulgarian, Rumanian, Russian, and Georgian monks and monasteries.

According to Joseph Georgirenes, archbishop of Samos (1666–71), there were approximately six thousand monks living on Athos in his day, including about eight hundred in the Serbian monastery of Chilandar and two hundred in the Bulgarian monastery of Zographou, revealing that in the late seventeenth century there was a considerable Slavic presence on the Holy Mountain.[69] The eleemosynary activities of Rumanian and Russian rulers further strengthened Athos as a central meeting ground and clearing house of Byzantine religious, literary, artistic, and other traditions for the entire Orthodox world during Ottoman times. Athos was both a living organism in the culture of what has been termed the Byzantine Commonwealth and a rich repository of its artistic and literary treasures. Icons, frescoes, and manuscripts figured actively in the ongoing Byzantine culture of this unique monastic community. In their liturgical and ascetical life the monks were surrounded and guided by manuscripts, books, and icons produced in the Byzantine tradition. These shaped and refined their consciousness of that tradition, as well as of its enemies, Islam and the Latin Church. Further, these literary and artistic treasures offered a rich variety of choices, which on occasion led the monks to revert to one or another text/ideal or artistic style and to revive cultural forms from the Byzantine past, as in the case of Dionysios and his *Ermeneia*. The influence of Mount Athos was such that it radiated, at times, far beyond the Athonite peninsula to Asia Minor and to Greek, Serbian, Bulgarian, Russian, and Rumanian lands. This radiation was facilitated not only by the strength of the Byzantine tradition on the Holy Mountain, but also by the pan-Orthodox and multinational character of its community, and by the

fact that Byzantine formal culture had already put down roots in those lands.

Literature

One of the correspondents of Dionysios of Fourna was the Greek priest, teacher, and author Anastasios Gordios (1654/5–1729). Although born of a poor peasant family in a small mountain village in the district of Agrapha, he went early to the local monastic school and thereafter sought teachers successively at Karpenisi, Athens, and Yannina, returning to teach at the monastic school of St. Paraskevi, where he had had his first schooling. Ordained a priest, he went to Italy twice (1686–89, 1698–1701) to continue his schooling at Padua, Florence, and Rome, studying ancient Greek, Latin, medicine, and pharmacology, and coming into contact with Roman Catholic theology. On his return he dedicated himself to teaching (at schools in Karpenisi, Patras, Aetolikon, and finally from 1711 to 1729 at the monastic school of St. Paraskevi) and literary composition.[70] Of interest to us here are the personality of Gordios and his writing entitled, *Composition concerning Mohammed and against the Latins*, composed between 1717/18 and 1723, and therefore contemporary with the *Ermeneia* of his compatriot Dionysios (also from Agrapha). Just as Dionysios took Byzantine artistic traditions as his inspiration and guide, so Gordios derived his ideas, literary genre, and theological and historical principles from Byzantine antecedents.

Gordios meditated long and hard in the light of his personal experience and observation, as had his Byzantine predecessors, on the hardships of the Greeks, and indeed of the Orthodox peoples as a whole, under Muslim rule. Despite his education in the West and his work in translating classical Greek texts into demotic Greek, Gordios comprehended the enslavement of the Orthodox by the Muslims in religious, not secular, terms. Although earlier Byzantine etiological traditions on the subjugation of the Orthodox world by the forces of Islam (first Arab and then Turkish) presented two fundamentally different explanations, secular and religious, it was only the latter that absorbed this Greek priest of the Tourkokratia.[71]

To explain the military defeat and political oppression of the Orthodox world by Islam, facts from which he was convinced there was no salvation, Gordios turned to Scripture, and specifically to the Book of Revelation. His work is therefore an attempt at a historical exegesis of the Apocalypse and an apocalyptic explanation of the historical vicissitudes of

the Orthodox peoples.[72] Briefly stated, the four kingdoms in the dream of Nebuchadnezzar were Babylon, Persia, Greece/Macedonia, and Rome, but, Gordios observes, the greatest of all kingdoms is that of Muhammad, which has outlasted the others. Since it is not mentioned in the Apocalypse, this is the kingdom of Antichrist, a preparation for the Second Coming and the end of the present world. As he develops his theme Gordios states that the pope and Muhammad represent the two faces of the Antichrist and are identical with the two beasts in the Apocalypse. He then applies traditional Byzantine expositions of the two Latin "heresies" of papal primacy and the filioque and analyzes the hardships that Islam has inflicted on the Orthodox.

Whatever the novelties of his treatment, the genre (exegesis of the Apocalypse), the spirit (religious), and the polemic (against Latin Christianity and Islam) are Byzantine in origin. The archbishop of Thessaloniki, Symeon (d. 1429), had found himself in a very similar historical dilemma as Gordios some three centuries earlier, caught between the Latins (Venice) and Muslims (Turks). Though he excoriated both as diabolical evils, Symeon urged his flock to remain faithful to their Venetian rulers.[73] Gordios relates that the Orthodox live much as a shepherdless flock (that is, without an emperor) between two ferocious beasts. No sooner do they fall into the jaws of the one than they are snatched by the jaws of the other, continuing thus until that day when there will be no Orthodox Christians remaining. In contrast to the Thessalonian Symeon, Gordios felt that of the two "beasts" the more dangerous was the pope, for he endangered the souls of the Orthodox, whereas Muhammad endangered only their bodies. This is obviously a reflection of a man of the cloth, for Gordios himself states that in his day the converts to Roman Catholicism were few and represented the better educated and upper social class, whereas those who were constrained to convert to Islam in large numbers were of the lower class, poorer and less educated.

This medieval and very pessimistic Byzantine-inspired literary composition had a considerable success, as we learn from the editor of the text, who has identified thirty-seven manuscripts without exhausting the possibilities. Thirteen of these manuscripts are in the libraries of eight Athonite monasteries, and others were to be found at Patmos, Agrapha, Cyprus, the Peloponnese, Jerusalem, Constantinople, Bucharest, and Smyrna.[74] The work of Gordios is representative of only one aspect of the dynamic life of Byzantine literary traditions in the Greek literature of the Ottoman period. I shall not go into the main body of homiletics, epistolography, archival style, hagiography, theology, and rhetoric.

What of the literary traditions among the other Balkan peoples? The first of these to come under the influence of Byzantine literature were the Bulgarians, particularly in the reigns of Boris (852–89) and the great Symeon (893–927).[75] The religious literature of Byzantium was decisive not only in this first golden age of Bulgarian literature but also later, in what has been called the "Second South Slavic Influence." Euthymios of Tirnovo, as a result of his extended stays in Constantinople and on Mount Athos, took with him a knowledge of Byzantine literature and founded the school of Tirnovo, which became a new center of Bulgarian literary activity, and where in 1375 he became patriarch of the Bulgarian Church.[76] With the conquest of Tirnovo by the Turks in 1393 the scholars there scattered, taking the manuscripts and the Slavo-Byzantine tradition with them to Serbia, Russia, and the Rumanian lands.

Although Bulgarian literary activity suffered a disastrous blow in the Ottoman conquest and did not attain a high plateau again until the Bulgarian *Vuzrazhdane* (renaissance) in the nineteenth century, it did not disappear. The last flickering light of the Tirnovo school is seen in the hagiographic activity of the two sixteenth-century authors Pop Pejo and Matei Grammatik. Both authors were active in Sofia, which by the latter sixteenth century is said to have had twelve Christian churches and two schools for the preparation of priests.[77] The primary compositions of these authors were two hagiographic-martyrological texts. Pop Pejo composed the life of Georgi Novi Sofiiski, burned to death for the faith in 1515 by the Turks in Sofia. Matei Grammatik composed his piece on the martyrdom of Nikola Novi Sofiiski, who was stoned to death for his faith by the Turks in Sofia in 1555. The genre, hagiography/martyrology, is of Byzantine origin, and the literary style is to some degree in the tradition of the Byzantino-Slavic school of Tirnovo.[78] Contemporaneously, Bulgarian scribes were copying the standard religious and liturgical manuscripts that the Orthodox rites required.

Among the most widespread of the Bulgarian texts in the seventeenth and first half of the eighteenth century were the so-called *Sborniks*. Written in a simpler language and therefore comprehensible to a larger audience, the Sborniks were of two types. The first usually contained miscellaneous texts or excerpts that included, among other things, lives, edifying tales, sermons, historical works, apocrypha, legends, prayers, and questions and answers on natural phenomena. Such materials were taken, by and large, from older, Byzantine and Slavo-Byzantine, literature, including the apocryphal tales of Adam and Eve, and the tales of Solomon and Baruch. Included also were lives from Euthymios, of Cyril and Meth-

odius, Clement, Ivan Rilski, materials from the cycle of the Trojan War, Akir the Wise, the *Fall of Tsargrad*, and the *Alexandrida*. In addition there were sermons of John Chrysostom, Gregory the Theologian, Damaskenos Studites, selections from the *Physiologos* and from the Byzantine chronicles of George Amartolos and Manasses. This first type of Sbornik was thus a florilegium, in a sense, drawing on earlier Slavo-Byzantine literature and reflecting the traditional moral and aesthetic values and Weltanschauung of the Byzantine cultural tradition.[79]

The second type of Sbornik, also very popular, is known in Bulgarian as the Damaskini. Appearing in the late sixteenth century, it became widespread throughout the Bulgarian-speaking lands. Whereas the contents of the first type of Sbornik represent an older Slavo-Byzantine tradition, those of the Damaskini reflect a contemporary Greek influence. The name derives from the author himself, Damaskenos Studites, a sixteenth-century Greek cleric of Thessaloniki, who brought together forty-three of his sermons in a text called the *Thesaurus*.[80] These sermons, or some part of them, were translated into Bulgarian in the latter half of the sixteenth century. The popularity of the text in Bulgarian is to be seen not only in its wide diffusion but also in the fact that it was translated at least ten times from the Greek, in various places, including Mount Athos and Bačkovo.[81] Thus the sixteenth-century hagiographies/martyrologies and the later Sborniks demonstrate that the Byzantine and Slavo-Byzantine literary traditions, with their contents, genres, and moral-aesthetic values, remained important and vital among the Bulgarians in Ottoman times.[82]

Notes

1. See *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 23–24 (1969–70).

2. By way of example, see Speros Vryonis, Jr., "Islamic Sources for the History of the Greek People," *Indiana Social Studies Quarterly* 32 (1973): 56–68; reprinted in idem, *Studies on Byzantium, Seljuks and Ottomans* (Malibu, Calif.: Undena Publications, 1981).

3. "The Byzantine Legacy and Ottoman Forms," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 23–24 (1969–70): 251–308; reprinted in Vryonis, *Studies*.

4. "The Greeks under Turkish Rule," in *Hellenism and the First Greek War of Liberation (1821–1830): Continuity and Change*, ed. Nikiforos P. Diamandouros et al. (Thessaloniki: Institute for Balkan Studies, 1976), 45–58; reprinted in Vryonis, *Studies*.

5. Lowell Clucas, ed., *The Byzantine Legacy in Eastern Europe* (Boulder, Colo.: East European Monographs, 1988), 107–45.

6. See Ömer Lûtfi Barkan, *Süleymaniye cami ve imareti inşaati (1550–1557)*, 2 vols. (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1972, 1979), which discusses in detail the expense, labor, and laborers in the building of the mosque complex of Süleyman the Lawgiver. One may also

consult the massive architectural survey of Ekrem Hakki Ayverdi, *Osmanlí mi'mârisinin ilk devri: Ertogrul, Osman, Orhan Gaziler Hudavendigar ve Yildirim Bayazid 630–805 (1230–1420)* (Istanbul: Baha Matbaasí, 1966); *Osmanlí mimarisinde Celebi ve II. Sultan Murad devri 806–855 (1403–1451)* (Istanbul: Baha Matbaasí, 1972); *Osmanlí mi'marisinde: Fatih devri 855–886 (1451–1481)* (Istanbul: Baha Matbaasí, 1973); *Avrupa'da osmanli mimarisi eserleri: Romanya Macaristan*, 1 cild, 1 ve 2 kitabi (Istanbul: Baha Matbaasí, 1977); *Yugoslavya*, II cild, 3 kitap, (Istanbul: Baha Matbaasí, 1981); *Yugoslavya*, III cild, 3 kitap, (Istanbul: Baha Matbaasí, 1981); *Bulgaristan, Yunanistan, Arnavutluk*, IV cild, 4, 5, 6 kitap, (Istanbul: Baha Matbaasí, 1982). On the pious foundations of Istanbul, see Ömer Lûtfi Barkan and Ekkrem Hakkí Ayverdi, *Istanbul vakiflari tahrir defteri 953 (1546)* (Istanbul: Baha Matbaasí, 1970).

7. On the establishment of the Ottomans in the towns, see *Encyclopedia of Islam*, new [2d] ed., s.v. "Istanbul"; Heath W. Lowry, "Portrait of a City: The Population and Topography of Ottoman Selanik (Thessaloniki) in the Year 1478," *Diptycha* 2 (1980–81): 254–93; Speros Vryonis, Jr., "The Ottoman Conquest of Thessaloniki in 1430," in *Continuity and Change in Late Byzantine and Early Ottoman Society*, ed. Anthony Bryer and Heath Lowry (Birmingham and Washington, D.C.: University of Birmingham and Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1986), 281–322; Heath W. Lowry, *Trabzon şehrinin islamlaşma ve türkleşmesi: 1461–1583* (Istanbul: L'Université Boğaziçi, 1981); Speros Vryonis, Jr., "Religious Change and Patterns in the Balkans, Fourteenth-Sixteenth Centuries," in *Aspects of the Balkans: Continuity and Change*, ed. Hendrik Birnbaum and Speros Vryonis, Jr. (The Hague: Mouton, 1972), 151–76; reprinted in Vryonis, *Studies*.

8. Speros Vryonis, Jr., "Mikra Asia," in *Istoria tou ellenikou ethnous*, 16 vols. (Athens: Ekdotike Athenon, 1971–78) (hereafter cited as *IEE*), 7:426–39.

9. Herbert Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*, 2 vols. (Munich: C. H. Beck, 1978), 2:400–476.

10. On the agrarian laws of the Macedonians, see George Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State*, trans. Joan Hussey, rev. ed. (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers Univ. Press, 1969), 217, 272–76, 280–82, 306–7; idem, "Agrarian Conditions in the Byzantine Empire in the Middle Ages," in *Cambridge Economic History of Europe*, 2d ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1966–), 1:205–34, 774–79; Paul Lemerle, *The Agrarian History of Byzantium from the Origins to the Twelfth Century: The Sources and Problems* (Galway: Officina Typographica, Galway Univ. Press, 1979). On the Rhodian Sea Law, see Walter Ashburner, ed., *The Rhodian Sea Law* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1909).

11. Ostrogorsky, 273.

12. The evidence has been brought together in Speros Vryonis, Jr., "Local Institutions in the Greek Islands and Elements of Byzantine Continuity during Ottoman Rule," to appear in the *Izvestiia* of the Ivan Dujčev Institute in Sofia. See also Demetrios Chomatianos, in Ioannes D. Zepos and Panagiotes Ioannes Zepos, *Jus Graecoromanum*, 8 vols. (Athens: G. Fexis, 1931; rpt. Aalen: Scientia, 1962) (hereafter cited as *JGR*), 8:325–26, 330–34; Konstantinos Armenopoulos, *Procheiron nomon e Hexabiblos*, ed. Konstantinos G. Pitsakes (Athens: Dodone, 1971), III, iii, 103–12; and Franz Dölger, *Aus den Schatzkammern des Heiligen Berges*, 2 vols. (Munich: Münchner Verlag, 1948), 1: nos. 20, 1147.

13. Demetrios S. Gines, *Perigramma istorias tou metabyzantinou dikaiou* (Athens: Graphcion Demosieumaton Akademias Athenon, 1966), no. 100.

14. See above, n. 12.

15. Gines, no. 134.

16. Gines, no. 221.

17. *JGR* 8:504–7.

18. *JGR* 8:522.

19. Gines, no. 802.

20. *JGR* 8:504–7.

21. *JGR* 8:522.

22. Gines, nos. 134, 237.

23. *JGR* 8:504–7.

24. Georgios Andreas Petropoulos, *Notariakai praxeis Mykonou ton eton* 1663–177 (Athens: N.p., 1960), no. 25.

25. *JGR* 8:458–59; Georgios Andreas Petropoulos, *Nomika engrapha Siphnou tes sylloges G. Maridake (1684–1835) meta symbolon eis ten ereunan tou metabyzantinou dikaiou* (Ath-ens: Grapheion Demosieumaton Akademias Athenon, 1956), 232–33.

26. Georgios Andreas Petropoulos, *Notariakai praxeis Kephallenias tes sylloges E. Blessa ton eton 1701–1856* (Athens, 1962), nos. B96, B97; idem, *Notariakai praxeis Paxon diaphoron notarion ton eton 1658–1810* (Athens: N.p., 1958), nos. 508, 520.

27. Vladimir Georgescu, *Bizanţul şi instituţiile româneşti pînă la mijlocul secolului al XVIII-lea* (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1980), 199–206.

28. See above, n. 12.

29. Gines, no. 647; *JGR* 8:559.

30. Gines, no. 580.

31. Gines, no. 647.

32. For the basic rates of interest, see Gines, no. 580.

33. On the nature of the maritime loan and maritime risk, see the two cases in Pe-tropoulos, *Praxeis Kephallenias*, nos. 123, 124, 126.

34. Petropoulos, *Praxeis Paxon*, nos. 354, 499.

35. Gines, no. 580.

36. Petropoulos, *Praxeis Paxon*, no. 354.

37. Ibid., no. 499.

38. Rhodian Sea Law, pt. 2, chaps. 1–7 (Ashburner, 1–2; trans. 57).

39. Gines, no. 498.

40. Rhodian Sea Law, pt. 3, chap. 9 (Ashburner, 16–17; trans. 87). See also pt. 3, chaps.
31, 35 (Ashburner, 29, 31; trans. 108, 110).

41. Rhodian Sea Law, pt. 2, chap. 17 (Ashburner, 3–4; trans. 65).

42. Rhodian Sea Law, pt. 3, chap. 16 (Ashburner, 21; trans. 96).

43. Rhodian Sea Law, pt. 3, chaps. 16, 17 (Ashburner, 21–22; trans. 96–97) and
Ashburner, ccix–ccxxxiv; *Basilica*, 53.3.8.

44. Rhodian Sea Law, pt. 2, chap. 18; pt. 3, chaps. 9–11, 17, 22, 30, 33, 38 (Ashburner,
4, 16–19, 22, 25, 28–29, 30, 32–33; trans. 67, 87, 91–92, 97, 102–3, 107, 109, 112).

45. Ibid.

46. *Basilica*, 53.1.15, which refers to "synallagmata."

47. II.ii.5.

48. *Basilica*, 53.3.22; Armenopoulos, II.ii.19. Rewards are given to sailors who salvage
such goods, but the salvagers do not acquire title (Rhodian Sea Law, pt. 3, chaps. 45–47
[Ashburner, 37–38; trans. 117–19]).

49. *Basilica*, 56.3.19.

50. Speros Vryonis, Jr., "Byzantine Legacy in Folk Life and Tradition" (see above, n. 5),
133–35.

51. Georgios A. Megas, *Greek Calendar Customs* (Athens: Press and Information Depart-
ment, Prime Minister's Office, 1958), 142–44; Edmund Schneeweis, *Serbokroatische Volks-
kunde* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1961), 142.

52. Megas, 113–16; Schneeweis, 136–37; Christo Vakarelski, *Bulgarische Volkskunde*,
trans. N. Damerau, K. Gutschmidt, and N. Reiter (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1969), 320–22.

53. Megas, 55; Schneeweis, 125; Vakarelski, 319.

54. For well organized and structured surveys of the calendars of the Greeks, Serbs, and Bulgars, see Megas, Schneeweis, and Vakarelski.

55. Andreas Xyngopoulos, *Schediasma istorias tes threskeutikes zographikes meta ten Alosin* (Athens: Archaiologike Etaireia, 1957); Manolis Chatzidakis, "Les debuts de l'Ecole cré-toise, et la question de l'école dite italo-grecque," in *Mnemosynon Sophias Antoniade* (Venice: Ellenikon Institouton Benetias Byzantinon kai Metabyzantinon Spoudon, 1974), 169–211. See also the short essays by various authors in the exhibition catalogue, *From Byzan-tium to El Greco: Greek Frescoes and Icons* (Athens: Greek Ministry of Culture, Byzantine Museum of Athens, 1987), reprinted with some changes as *Holy Image, Holy Space: Icons and Frescoes from Greece* (Athens: Greek Ministry of Culture, Byzantine Museum of Athens, 1988).

56. Manolis Chatzidakis, "Techne," in *IEE* 11:243–66, for an excellent detailed analysis.

57. *Dionysiou tou ek Phourna Ermeneia tes zographikes technes kai ai kyriai autes anekdotoi pegai, ekdidomene meta prologou nun to proton pleres kata to prototypon autou keimenon*, ed. A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus (St. Petersburg: B. Kirschbaum, 1909). For an English translation of the whole treatise, see *The "Painter's Manual" of Dionysius of Fourna*, trans. Paul Hether-ington (London: Sagittarius Press, 1974). The translations that I am giving here are my own.

58. *Dionysiou tou ek Phourna Ermeneia*, xxv–xxxii.

59. Ibid., 237.

60. Ibid., 3–4.

61. Ibid., 5–6.

62. Ibid., 6–7.

63. Ibid., 7.

64. Ibid., 7–8.

65. Ibid., 8.

66. Ibid.

67. Vasile Grecu, "Byzantinische Handbücher der Kirchenmalerei," *Byzantion* 9 (1934):
675–701; idem, *Cărţi de pictură bisericească bizantină* (Cernăuţi, 1936).

68. Asen Vasiliev, *Erminii: Tekhnologiia i ikonografiia* (Sofia: Izdatelstvo Septemvri, 1976).

69. Philipp Meyer, *Die Haupturkunden für die Geschichte der Athosklöster* (Leipzig, 1894;
rpt. Amsterdam: A. M. Hakkert, 1965), 67–68; Ch. Patrineles, "Oi mones tou ellenikou
chorou," in *IEE* 10:133 for earlier figures, according to the sixteenth-century Zygomalas, at
around five thousand. For the earliest Ottoman figures, see Heath W. Lowry, "A Note on the
Population and Status of the Athonite Monasteries under Ottoman Rule (ca. 1520),"
Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 73 (1981): 115–35, who gives 1,442
monks from the Ottoman *defter* of 1520, for the twenty monasteries.

70. For details see the excellent study and edition of Asterios Argyriou, *Anastasiou tou
Gordiou (1654/5–1729) syngramma peri Moameth kai kata Latinon* (Athens: Association
Scientifique d'Etudes sur la Grèce Centrale, 1983).

71. On the two explanations, see Speros Vryonis, Jr., *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in
Asia Minor and the Process of Islamization from the Eleventh through the Fifteenth Century*
(Berkeley and Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press, 1971), 403–43.

72. For what follows, consult the clear analysis of Argyriou (above, n. 70).

73. Speros Vryonis, Jr., "Crises and Anxieties in Fifteenth-Century Byzantium and the
Reassertion of Old, and the Emergence of New, Cultural Forms," in *Islamic and Middle
Eastern Societies: A Festschrift in Honor of Professor Wadie Jwaideh*, ed. Robert Olson (Brat-
tleboro, Vt.: Amana Books, 1987), esp. 107–8, 113–14, 115–17; David Balfour, ed.,

Politico-Cultural Works of Symeon Archbishop of Thessalonica (1416/17–1429) (Vienna: Verl. d. Österr. Akad. d. Wiss., 1979).

74. Argyriou, 10 and Annex 1.

75. *Istoriia na bulgarskata literatura*, vol. 1, *Starobulgarska literatura* (Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Bulgarskata Akademiia na Naukite, 1962), 23–253.

76. Ibid., 286–88.

77. Ibid., 381–84.

78. Ibid., 380–401.

79. Ibid., 404–5.

80. A. Angelou, "Poikilomorpha erga tes logias paradoses," in *IEE* 11:382–83.

81. *Istoriia na bulgarskata literatura*, 1:405–6.

82. I do not go here into the question of Byzantine and Byzantino-Slavic traditions in the literary activity of the Serbs and Rumanians in Ottoman times. This tradition is also noteworthy, but the literature of these two peoples was both more extensive and more influenced by the outside world than that of the Bulgarians. See *Istoria literaturii romîne*, vol. 1 (Bucharest: Editura Academici Republicii Populare Romine, 1970); *Srpska knjizhevnost u knjizhevnoj kritici*, 2d ed., vol. 1, *Stara knjizhevnost*, ed. Jovan Hristić (Belgrade: Nolit, 1972); and Milorad Pavić, *Istorija srpske knjizhevnosti baroknog doba (XVII i XVIII* [illegible] (Belgrade: Nolit, 1970).

WAS THERE EVER A "THIRD ROME"? REMARKS ON THE BYZANTINE LEGACY IN RUSSIA

John Meyendorff

SEVERAL EAST EUROPEAN countries adopted Orthodox Christianity from Byzantium and thereby accepted as the foundation of their literary and spiritual culture the entire corpus of the Byzantine liturgy, translated into Slavic, as well as the idea of a universal empire responsible for the unity of the Christian world. Of these countries, Russia alone remained untouched by the Turkish conquest. Historically, therefore, the problem of "Byzantium after Byzantium" is different when applied to Russia than when applied to the Balkan states.[1] The conversion of the princess Olga (957) and, later, of her grandson Vladimir (988–89), established the "land of Rus'," extending from the Carpathian mountains to the Volga and from Novgorod to the steppes, which were inhabited by Khazars and Pechenegs, as part of the "Byzantine Commonwealth," without making it ever a part of the empire. Russian princes recognized the universal moral supremacy of the Eastern Roman emperor, but not his political domination.

The Church of Russia, however, was administratively dependent upon Byzantium for centuries, from 988 until 1448. The metropolitan "of Kiev and all Russia" (Κιέβου καὶ πάσης Ῥωσίας) was generally a Greek, always appointed from Constantinople. Only in the later period,—in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries,—was there a regular alternation of Greeks and Russians as heads of the church, but the Russian candidates made the voyage to Constantinople in order to obtain consecration to the office of metropolitan.[2] The prestige and influence of the church were great, because it represented the only administrative structure extending over the entire country. Indeed, Kievan Russia was divided between warring principalities. Later, following the disastrous Mongol conquest

(1237–40), the northeastern principalities became a part of the Mongol empire centered in Peking, whereas the parts that were later known as the Ukraine and Byelorussia fell under Lithuanian and Polish domination.

The Council of Florence and the Fall of Byzantium: Aftermath in Russia

The weak Byzantine empire of the Palaeologan emperors (1261–1453) was not able, by itself, to determine events in Russia, but it exercised indirect influence through its diplomatic ties with the Mongol Khans (who were enemies of the Turks), and through its alliance with the Genoese, who controlled commerce with the Far East through the Black Sea. This Mongol-Genoese-Byzantine "axis" explains, at least partly, the diplomatic favors extended by Byzantium, through the church, to the great principality of Moscow, which began its political ascent as an ally of the Mongols. But religious factors also played a role: the western principalities, under Polish and Lithuanian domination, were more susceptible to fall under the spell of Latin Christendom. In fact, in 1386 Poland and Lithuania—with their numerous Orthodox population—were united under a Roman Catholic king. Even before that date, the Ecumenical Patriarchate had felt that Orthodoxy was more secure under the Mongols, and had supported the transfer of the metropolitan's see from Kiev to Moscow.

Paradoxically, as the empire was shrinking more and more, the ties between the Ecumenical Patriarchate and the Russian metropolitanate were strengthened. This was due to the activity of strong metropolitans like Cyprian (1375–1406)—a Bulgarian and close friend and disciple of the hesychast patriarch Philotheos Kokkinos—and Photius (1408–31), a Greek from Monemvasia. The famous embroidered *sakkos* of the latter, an episcopal dalmatic, featuring prominently the images of the Byzantine emperor John VIII and Grand Prince Basil I of Moscow, with their wives, represents the clear political and religious program which he was sent to fulfill as metropolitan: to assure the continuous membership of Russia in the Byzantine Commonwealth.[3] This mission was spelled out quite explicitly also in the often-quoted letter of Patriarch Anthony to Basil I, written in 1393, a few years before the appointment of Photius: the Byzantine emperor is emperor "of the Romans, that is of all Christians. . . . For Christians, it is not possible to have a Church, and not have an emperor." But the patriarch added: "Christians reject only the heretical

emperors, who were raging against the Church and introducing doctrines that were corrupt and foreign to the teachings of the Apostles and the Fathers."[4]

When Metropolitan Photius died (1431), the Byzantine authorities were deeply involved in preparing a Union council, intended to secure direct Western help against the advancing Turks. In order to secure Russian support and commitment, a well-trained diplomat, Isidore, was appointed as metropolitan of Kiev and All Russia, while the grand prince's candidate, Bishop Jonas of Ryazan'—who had already come to Constantinople to receive the appointment—was rather humiliatingly rejected (1437–38). But Russian loyalty to Byzantium was not shaken: Isidore received money and a large retinue from Grand Prince Basil II, "the Blind," and traveled to Florence for the council, representing the metropolitanate of Russia.

In reading some modern historians of the period, one gets the impression that the Muscovite grand prince was eagerly awaiting the opportunity to supplant Byzantium and to assume the position of emperor of a "Third Rome." The facts reported above speak strongly against that view. The grand principality was still under Mongol rule. It had just gone through a long and bloody dynastic struggle, during which Basil II was blinded by a competitor before recovering his throne. The national—and somewhat "messianic"—self-affirmation of the Russians came later. It occurred as a reaction to Florence and to the subsequent fall of Constantinople, and it came about gradually, never taking the form of an official *translatio imperii* from Constantinople to Moscow.

Isidore returned to Moscow from Florence in 1441, as a cardinal of the Roman Church, after traveling through Italy, Hungary, and Poland. The Russians had been informed, both by their own delegates to Florence and by connections in Constantinople, of the resistance of Mark of Ephesus to the conciliar decrees and of the subsequent recanting of a majority of the Greek signatories. The grand prince's decision to reject Isidore was not an anti-Byzantine revolt; rather it was based on the expectation of an Orthodox restoration in Byzantium. In a highly respectful letter to the newly elected patriarch Metrophanes—who supported Florence in principle but was not in a position to proclaim officially a union of the churches—the grand prince requested permission to elect a metropolitan locally: "We beg your most holy lordship to examine your holy and divine Greek canons . . . and authorize the appointment of a metropolitan to be effected in our own country."[5] No reply came, and the Russians waited for

seven years before performing in 1448 the independent appointment of the formerly rejected candidate, Jonas of Ryazan', as metropolitan of Kiev and All Russia. The appointment was recognized as legitimate not only in Muscovy but also in the dioceses located in the Polish-Lithuanian domain, through a formal investiture of Jonas by King Casimir IV. In another letter, addressed in 1451 to the new Byzantine emperor Constantine (there was not a patriarch that year in Constantinople, since the Uniate incumbent, Gregory Mammas, had left for Rome), the grand prince promised that, once there was an Orthodox patriarch, "it will be our duty to write to him . . . and ask his blessing in all things."[6] The subsequent events in Constantinople are well known: the Union was formally proclaimed at Hagia Sophia in December 1452 and the city fell in May 1453.

Rejection of Florence, but also politeness and reserve towards the desperate and wavering authorities in Constantinople, had been, therefore, the official attitude of the Russians in 1439–53. Unofficial reactions, however, often took a different bent. They came, first, from the Russian clerics who had accompanied Isidore to Italy and had followed his leadership in recognizing the Union. The Russian bishop Avraamy of Suzdal had indeed signed the decree. The Greeks, who had also signed, but eventually recanted, blamed psychological and material pressures exercised upon them by the Latins. The Russians put the blame on the "deviousness" of Isidore and the "betrayal" of the Greeks. Patriarch Anthony, in 1393, had called the Russians to be loyal to Orthodox Byzantium but had recognized the need to "reject heretical emperors."[7] The argument was now seen as fully applicable to the situation after 1439: "Oh great sovereign emperor," wrote one polemicist, addressing John VIII Palaeologus, signatory of the Union, "why did you go to them? . . . You have exchanged light for darkness; instead of the divine law, you have received the Latin faith; . . . Formerly you were the agent of piety, now you are the sower of evil seeds."[8] Under the circumstances, it was the grand prince of Moscow who had to be seen as a "new Constantine," savior of Orthodoxy.[9] But the same argument was used to exalt, not only Moscow, but other Russian centers, for instance Tver, whose prince Boris had also sent a representative to the council and now, after rejecting the Latin faith, was said by one polemicist to deserve an imperial diadem.[10] Furthermore, in Novgorod, under Archbishop Gennadios (1484–1509), there appeared a curious Russian variation on the Donation of Constantine, the Legend of the White Cowl. According to this legend, a white cowl (*klobuk*; Gr. ἐπικαλίμαυκον) was donated by Constantine the Great to Pope Sylvester following his bap-

tism; the last Orthodox pope, foreseeing Rome's fall into heresy, sent the cowl for safekeeping to Patriarch Philotheos of Constantinople, who eventually (also foreseeing the betrayal of Florence) sent the precious relic to the archbishop of Novgorod.[11] Thus not only Moscow, but also Tver and Novgorod, were somehow claiming to be the heirs of "Rome" and centers of the true Christian faith.

But of course, the destiny of becoming an imperial capital belonged to Moscow. It is to its grand prince that the monk Filofei of Pskov (ca. 1510–40) addressed his famous letter: "All Christian realms will come to an end and will unite into the one single realm of our sovereign, that is, into the Russian realm, according to the prophetic books. Both Romes fell, the third endures, and a fourth there will not be."[12] But, as Georges Florovsky and others have shown, the theory of Moscow the "Third Rome" was formulated in an apocalyptic context: for Filofei, Moscow was not only the "third," but more importantly the "last," Rome, and he was calling the grand prince to repentance and Christian virtue, motivating his appeals by the imminence of the Second Coming. Politically the appeal had little practical application. The Muscovite sovereigns were in the process of building up a national empire, inspired largely by Western Renaissance models and ideas, and had little use for apocalyptics. The theory of the "Third Rome," or that of a *translatio imperii* from Constantinople to Moscow, was never accepted as official state theory.

In 1472 Ivan III married the niece of the last emperor of Constantinople, who had lived in Italy and received a Western education. Although the marriage undoubtedly enhanced his prestige, it did not imply the assumption of the imperial title,[13] and the practical effect of the marriage consisted in increasing substantially Italian influence in Muscovy: the Kremlin was then rebuilt *more italico* by Italian architects. In 1547 Ivan IV, grandson of Ivan III, was crowned tsar (the Slavic equivalent of "emperor") according to a modified Byzantine ceremonial, but he did not assume the title of "emperor of the Romans," as a *translatio imperii* and the theory of a "Third Rome" would require, but that of "tsar of all the Rus'." Furthermore, he requested the formal recognition of his title from the patriarch of Constantinople, sending lavish gifts to the ecumenical throne. The reply came in the form of two letters of Patriarch Joasaph (1555–65). In the first, the patriarch expressed reservations: only the Roman pope and the patriarch of Constantinople, he wrote, have the right to crown emperors legitimately, so that the tsar should be crowned anew by the patriarch's delegate, the metropolitan of Evripos, carrier of the

letter. The second document had the form of a synodal act, sanctioning the crowning, once it would be performed by the aforementioned metropolitan, and proposing an original scheme, proving Ivan's legitimacy: he was a descendant of Princess Anna, wife of St. Vladimir, and sister of the Byzantine emperor Basil II.[14]

No second crowning of Ivan ever took place, but the episode illustrates the continuous respect of the Muscovite authorities for the traditional ties between Russia and the mother church of Constantinople, in spite of the painful break of 1448–53. The same loyalty would be expressed in the procedures connected with the establishment of the patriarchate of Moscow in 1589.

Being in desperate need of material support, Ecumenical Patriarch Jeremiah II traveled to Moscow in 1588. This was an unforeseen opportunity for the Russian authorities to consider the possibility of proclaiming the establishment of a "Third Rome." Indeed, they offered Jeremiah permanent residence in Russia, with his see in the ancient city of Vladimir, which would thereby become the center of the Orthodox world. Jeremiah's refusal of this offer led to an alternative: the establishment of a new patriarchate in Moscow. The act was peformed by Jeremiah and later confirmed by synods, including the other patriarchs, particularly the intelligent and influential Meletios Pegas of Alexandria, in 1590 and 1593.[15] The meaning of these texts clearly implies the restoration of a "pentarchy" of patriarchs, which had been reduced to a "tetrarchy" by the defection of the bishop of Rome. The new patriarchate of Moscow was not seen to be an equivalent of the distant patriarchate of Georgia, or those of Pec or Ohrid, or of the archdiocese of Cyprus (all of which churches were still, at least nominally, in existence, but were neither consulted nor mentioned in the acts). Together with Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, Moscow was to become one of the five sees recognized in the legislation of Justinian as the "five senses" of world Orthodoxy. Patriarch Job, with the title of "patriarch of Moscow and all Russia, and of the Northern parts," (τῶν ὑπερβορείων μερῶν), was to be the "fifth patriarch," "counted" with the other four and sharing their dignity. He was to recognize "the apostolic throne of Constantinople as its head and its primate, as the other patriarchs do." It was also proclaimed that Constantinople and the other patriarchates had their positions and rights defined by councils "for no other reason than their place within the imperial system."[16] The motivation of the rights of Moscow resided, therefore, in the existence of the Russian "empire," so that the name of the "most pious *basileus* of

Moscow and *autokrator* of all Russia and the Northern parts" was now to be included at the required moments of imperial commemorations in the liturgical books everywhere.[17]

There is no doubt therefore that the establishment of the patriarchate of Moscow was, in itself, a most solemn reaffirmation of Byzantine traditions. The Byzantine "spirit" remained even in the fact that the new patriarchate was granted the fifth, and not the first, place among the patriarchates. Was not the same sense of established tradition and custom preserved as Constantinople, the "New Rome," refrained (until the schism) from claiming the first place above the "old imperial Rome"? Similarly, the "Third Rome" did not overtake the "second." However, there was also an aura of unreality around the events of 1589, not because Russians, or Greeks, did not *want* to preserve the Byzantine tradition in Russia, but because, at the very end of the sixteenth century, so many historical and cultural developments occurred that the political and legal aspects of that tradition were largely bypassed by existing political realities.

I mentioned earlier that, already in the fifteenth century, the grand principality of Moscow had begun building a national empire. Tsar Ivan IV the "Terrible" (1533–84)—his popular name, *groznyi*, is actually better translated as "awesome"—was an avid reader of Machiavelli. The focus of his cultural and political interests was Europe, not Byzantium. In the seventeenth century, "Europe" intervened in the very fabric of Muscovite national consciousness in the form of Polish and Swedish invasions during the so-called Time of Troubles (1598–1613), and also a greatly increased cultural and ideological influence coming from the West. All of this provoked a real crisis of Byzantinism in Russia, which occurred in the seventeenth century but was already in the making much earlier.

A Crisis of "Byzantinism"

The tragedy of the Council of Florence and the fall of Byzantium were interpreted by some Russian polemicists as an ultimate betrayal, followed by divine punishment. But at the same time, Russian contacts with and support for the Orthodox faithful under Turkish domination, travels to holy places by Russian pilgrims, visits to Middle Eastern monasteries—particularly Sinai, Mar Sabba in Palestine, and Mount Athos—served as strong assurances that Orthodoxy and the Byzantine tradition were still alive among Greeks, Arabs, and Balkan Slavs. The assumption by the metropolitanate of Russia of a de facto ecclesiastical independence in 1448

did not imply any break of communion with the Eastern patriarchates restored in Constantinople after 1453.

Furthermore, the Russians were always aware of the fact that Orthodoxy had come to them "from the Greeks," and therefore almost automatically looked for Greek sources of the true faith. The most conservative among them feared Western threats against the purity of the tradition received through St. Vladimir from Byzantium.

It is impossible to present here a complete history of the intellectual, spiritual, and personal contacts between Greeks and Russians in the late medieval and early modern periods.[18] A few remarks about the great figure of Maximus "the Greek" should suffice to illustrate both the importance and the ambiguity of the cultural and religious relations between Russians and Greeks in the sixteenth century and explain in advance the tragedy of the seventeenth.

Ecclesiastically independent and self-conscious in its role as stronghold of Orthodoxy, Muscovite society was intellectually and spiritually nourished by what Russian writers referred to as the "Books" (*knigi*)—essentially the great body of liturgical, hagiographic, canonical, and theological writings translated from the Greek over the years. There were valuable local writings as well—especially *Lives* of saints and sermons—but these were closely connected in their style and content to Byzantine models. This Byzantine and South Slavic impact had been particularly strong during the rise of the monastic hesychast movement in Greek and Slavic lands in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. And yet by 1516 it was discovered that no one in Russia knew Greek, and therefore no one possessed the ability to make more translations of useful patristic texts, or to correct accumulated errors in existing Slavonic manuscripts. The Russians were rapidly entering a new and "modern" era of their history, but being also fully committed to the preservation of the Byzantine religious and cultural legacy, they lacked the means to use it meaningfully and critically.

In 1516, therefore, an embassy of Grand Prince Basil III traveled to Mount Athos and Constantinople, requesting that a Greek scholar be sent to Moscow, to help with translations and corrections. But there was no "Cyril" or "Methodius" among the Greeks either: the man who went to Muscovy was the monk Maximus, from the Athonite monastery of Vatopedi, and he knew no Slavic.

This last limitation, however crucial in view of his specific new mission, did not prevent Maximus from being one of the most extraordi-

nary and talented men of his age.[19] Born in Arta around 1470 as Michael Trivolis, he became attracted, as other representatives of the surviving Greek intelligentsia also were, by the cultural atmosphere of Renaissance Italy. Traveling first to Florence—where he read Plato under the guidance of Marsilio Ficino—and then to Bologna, Padua, and Milan, before spending two years in Venice as an associate of Aldus Manutius, the publisher of Greek classics, he finally worked four years in Mirandola for the Hellenist Gianfrancesco Pico. The last stage of his stay in Italy was even more remarkable: for two years (1502–4), he may have lived at San Marco in Florence. His religious vocation was spurred by the example of San Marco's prior, the famous Girolamo Savonarola, who had been executed in 1498 for his denunciations of corruption and immorality.

In 1504, however, Michael Trivolis abandoned Italy to become an Athonite monk under the name of Maximus. During the rest of his life, he remained discreet about his past in Italy, but there can be little doubt that his curriculum vitae was known not only on Mount Athos but also by the Russian authorities. It might have been seen as an additional asset for his mission to Muscovy, for the mother of Basil III, Zoe-Sophia Paleologina, had been educated in Italy and had contributed to Italian tastes at the Muscovite court.

Sent to Moscow but hoping to return eventually to his Athonite retreat, Maximus would remain there, much against his will, for over thirty years, until his death in 1556. After a while he learned the Slavonic language, but his work as a translator began through the curious method of translating first a Greek patristic commentary on the Psalter into Latin, with a Russian diplomat, Dimitri Gerasimov, making a translation from Latin into Slavonic. Some misinterpretations were inevitable. Furthermore, Maximus, a man of wide international horizons and strong critical opinions, expressed unconventional views, which were embarrassing to many. Invoking the preaching of Savonarola, he castigated the wealth of monasteries and received, on this point, the support not only of Russian hesychasts (the "Transvolgan elders"), but also of a powerful party at court. When this party lost the battle against the spokesmen of the socially oriented abbot Joseph of Volotsk and metropolitan Daniel, Maximus's prestige at the court suffered also. As he was also calling the Russian metropolitanate to return to the canonical obedience of the ecumenical patriarchate (as was originally intended when Jonas was consecrated by Russian bishops in 1448), and as he was suggesting that the Muscovite grand prince should undertake an anti-Turkish crusade to liberate Con-

stantinople (an unrealistic project, since Moscow was quite absorbed by its struggle against Poland and the Tatars), he fell out of favor completely. Arrested, repeatedly tried (in 1525 and 1531), accused of heresy and political treason, he remained in monastic confinement until around 1548. Freed by Ivan IV, he spent his last years writing and meeting many high-placed personalities. From the seventeenth century on, he was locally venerated as a saint, and he was officially canonized in 1988.

Around 1540, in one of his writings, he used an allegory that reflects not only the tragedy of his personal life, but also the fate of the Byzantine tradition: he remembered once encountering an old woman, sitting near a road, dressed in black, surrounded by menacing lions and bears, wolves, and foxes. She spoke to Maximus and gave her name: *Vasileia* ("empire," or "kingdom,"), and explained that the road, bare and desolate, is this "last" cursed age.[20]

However, the bitter nostalgia and understandable pessimism of Maximus did not represent the concluding motif of Russian Byzantinism. There came the tragedy of the seventeenth century.

The century began with a dynastic crisis, with the curious appearance of several pretenders to the throne under the name of Ivan IV's murdered son, Dimitri, and with a Polish occupation of Moscow itself. On the confused Russian political and ecclesiastical scene, there appeared Greeks, whose personalities—quite different from the venerable figures of Patriarchs Jeremiah II and Meletios Pegas, or from the wise and holy Maximus—tended to compromise the Byzantine "cause" in the eyes of the Russians. Among them was Ignatius, who usurped the patriarchal throne following the forced deposition of Patriarch Job. One generation later, a man called Paisios Ligarides, metropolitan of Gaza, was accepted as a major authority in ecclesiastical affairs in the restored Muscovite tsardom of Alexis Romanov (1645–76), but proved eventually to be a shady adventurer.

And yet the patriarch Nikon of Moscow (1652–58), with uncommon energy, tried to restore what he thought to be the Byzantine traditions and to reform the Russian Church by making it ritually and organizationally identical with the contemporary Greek Church.[21] The reform was actively supported by the tsar, who, in a gesture highly unusual in Muscovy, pledged obedience to the patriarch.

The motivation for the reforms came from the necessity of correcting liturgical books and practices—the very reason for which Maximus the Greek had been earlier invited to Russia. However, just as in the time of

Maximus, Russia lacked experts able to define what was the "right" way of worshipping. Everyone agreed that the "right" faith had been received by the Russians from the Greeks at the time of St. Vladimir, but what was the right way to restore that original ideal? Was it not by consulting ancient Greek and Russian manuscripts? A special envoy, Arseny Sukhanov, was sent to ecclesiastical centers and monasteries of the Balkans and the Middle East to acquire such manuscripts. He did obtain hundreds of them, which he brought to Moscow, making the patriarchal (later the synodal) library there one of the richest in the world for Greek codices. But there was nobody in Russia, in the seventeenth century, to make competent use of these books.

It was then that the powerful patriarch decided to adopt a simpler, but—as he soon found out—controversial solution. He decided to correct all Russian books and practices by making them identical to the contemporary Greek printed editions, as these were used under Ottoman occupation, ignoring the fact that they were not necessarily "Byzantine." The changes that he introduced were actually few, but some concerned every single person among the faithful. Thus instead of crossing themselves with *two* fingers (as they did before, and as was customary in Byzantium in the thirteenth century), the Russians were ordered to use *three* fingers. Russian clergy were required to dress like contemporary Greeks, with καμηλαύκια (Russ.: *kamilavki*), whose form was roughly that of the Turkish fez, and with ample-sleeved black *rasa*, borrowed from Turkish fashion. Long hair—a sign of *civil* power in Byzantium, adopted by Greek clergy, as the patriarchate of Constantinople was invested with civil responsibilities in the Ottoman Empire—was also to be grown by Russian priests and monks (who previously used the early Christian and Byzantine practice of the tonsure [Russ.: *gumentso*], having their hair cut as they entered either clerical or monastic life).

There is no doubt that Patriarch Nikon and Tsar Alexis were still inspired by the "Third Rome" idea. "I am a Russian," the patriarch is reported as saying, "but my faith is Greek." However, their decision to follow contemporary Greeks as models, and the authoritarian and despotic methods used in imposing the reforms, backfired badly. Millions of faithful rebelled. The rebels were headed by former personal friends of Nikon, notably the famous archpriest (*protopop*) Avvakum. Unenlightened as they might have been, the schismatics used arguments that carried weight. The Orthodox faith, they said, might well be "Greek," but are the seventeenth-century Greeks the same as the ones who taught St. Vladimir? Were not

the later Greeks delivered by God to Turkish slavery because of their betrayal at Florence? Did not Russia then become the last refuge of Orthodoxy? Are not the newly printed Greek books—which Nikon had adopted as originals for Russian reprinting—actually edited in Venice, that is, under Latin rule, where they might have been corrupted "by Jesuits"? Did not St. Paul write that it is shameful for a man to pray with a covered head, and to grow long hair as women do (I Cor. 11:4, 7, 14)? If church reforms are needed, are adventurers like Paisios Ligarides (eventually condemned not only in Russia, but in Constantinople too) the right advisors?

Eventually, Tsar Alexis tired of Nikon's authoritarianism and had him deposed. This deposition was confirmed by the Eastern patriarchs, but the same patriarchs—at a "great council" in Moscow (1666–67)—sanctioned all of Nikon's reforms.[22] But there were millions of rashly persecuted dissenters, the *Raskolniks*, or "Old Believers." Their leadership insisted on fanatic ritualism, and their rebellion was indeed a cultural and religious dead end: the fact that they were eventually split into a multitude of sects proves the point. Nevertheless, in seventeenth-century Russia they represented that part of the population that was religiously most committed and most unwilling to accept state and church authoritarianism.

The schism was an ultimate crisis of "Byzantinism." The reforms introduced by the official church assured Orthodox unity: even today, the Russian Church preserves, with utter exactness, the seventeenth-century Greek practices adopted by Nikon. But this was a formal Byzantinism, one of externals. The impact of many Western ideas was obvious. In aspiring to have the church rule over the state, Nikon was in fact inspired by papal ideology. The religious art of the period (in Russia, as in occupied Greece) was a pseudo-Byzantine art, giving signs of ultimate decadence. Liturgical music followed Western (particularly Ukrainian) forms in Russia, and increased oriental and Turkish patterns in Greece. The forced Westernization of Russia by Peter the Great—Tsar Alexis's son—was forthcoming, and was in many ways the logical consequence of what happened in the seventeenth century. In some sense, the dissenters were more faithful to the spirit of Byzantine Orthodoxy. Some of their traditions—iconography, music, and the very spirit of medieval Eastern Christianity—were most authentically Byzantine. But their absolutization of the Russian ways, as they knew them, and their secession from the hierarchical and sacramental life of the church, were a misinterpretation of the great, "catholic" Tradition in terms of "local traditions" only.

A Word of Conclusion: What Is Byzantinism?

My remarks concerning the Byzantine tradition in Russia seem to call for a rather negative conclusion. On the level of political ideology, the Muscovite tsars never seriously intended to follow the example of the medieval sovereigns of Bulgaria (Tsar Symeon in the tenth century, the tsars of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries) or Serbia (Tsar Dušan) and establish a new "Roman" empire. It appears to me that the role of the theory "Moscow the Third Rome" as an inspiration of Russian politics in the postmedieval age is much too often given an exaggerated importance. Whenever it was used in Muscovy it served as a subsidiary element in the building up of a national state, not as an ideological focus. Indeed, as I noticed earlier, the Muscovites created a "tsardom of all Russia," not a "Roman empire," and they were doing so in the spirit of their age. The imperial idea had lost its contents in the West as well, and Europe had become a Europe of "nations." The Greeks too were to use Byzantine ideas and terminology to justify calls to national liberation from the Turkish yoke, but the "Great Idea" that would inspire them would also be a "national" idea. If my sketchy review of relations between Greeks and Russians were to be extended to the eighteenth century, I would have to speak of the two Greek prelates, Eugenios Voulgaris (1716–1806) and Nikephoros Theotokes (1731–1800), who fared better at the court of Catherine the Great than did Maximus the Greek at the court of Basil III. But their vision was clearly dominated by the spirit of the Enlightenment, that of a "Greek" renaissance to be helped by Russian military and political might.[23]

Yet there is a sense in which Christian Byzantinism remained very much alive in Christian Russia. This Byzantine continuity can be discovered primarily on the level of religious experience. First of all, the perpetuation in Russia of the Byzantine liturgical tradition—preserved with the meticulous ritual conservatism of which the Russians alone were capable—established a vision of the faith and of Christian culture that theologians call "eschatological." The realities of the kingdom of God are seen as *different* from the concrete realities of the "fallen" world: the kingdom, therefore, is to be experienced sacramentally, ritually, mystically, and not by exercising political power, or engaging in social activism, to make the world better than it is. Besides, and somewhat beyond, the liturgical tradition, there is monastic mysticism, rooted in early Eastern Christianity, but actively perpetuated in the Byzantine world. This mysticism had been well understood by the Slavs, particularly the Russians. In

Russia, as in Byzantium, the saint was given a particular prophetic authority, with a certain priority not only over the state, but over ecclesiastical institutions as well. This explains not only the continuous "philokalic" tradition—essentially the tradition of the "Jesus prayer" and contemplative monasticism—but also the emergence in nineteenth-century Russia, as in contemporary Greece, of "lay theology" (or theology done by laymen), and the general acceptance, in the entire Orthodox world, of the belief that communion with God, and therefore responsibility for the faith, belongs to all the members of the church, so that the charisma of teaching, with which bishops are endowed, is an authority within the church, and not over it.

This attitude to Christianity, which is common to the entire Orthodox world, is reflected in culture as well. Whether in Greece, or in the Balkans, or in Russia, or in missionary countries in Asia or North America, people—including the uneducated and culturally immature—are immersed, through the liturgy, into a highly sophisticated world of Hellenistic poetry, patristic theology, and biblical symbolism. Religious art—music and iconography—also play an important role in communicating this "liturgical" vision of the kingdom of God, created in Byzantium. Of course, the level of understanding and participation are not the same for everybody and everywhere, but the basic models and criteria are the same for all. Transcending centuries and nationalities, this religious "Byzantinism" is, indeed, the major legacy of Byzantium.

As a civilization, as a political system, Byzantium died long ago. But the religious vision, created at the time when the empire existed, still inspires millions. It survived the political, economic, and ideological realities, which today are the concern of learned Byzantinists alone. The "vision" is only obscured when it is confused with either Byzantine political ideology, or the pseudo-Byzantine caricatures of that ideology, used later by nation-states and their secularized politicians.

Notes

1. See the pertinent remarks by Antonios-Emil Tachiaos, "Byzantium after Byzantium," in John Meyendorff et al., *The Legacy of St. Vladimir* (Crestwood, N.Y.: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1990).

2. On this period, see John Meyendorff, *Byzantium and the Rise of Russia: A Study of Byzantino-Russian Relations in the Fourteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1981).

3. For illustrations of the *sakkos*, see Alice Bank, *Byzantine Art in the Collections of Soviet Museums*, enl. ed., trans. Lenina Sorokina (Leningrad: Aurora Art Publishers, 1985), pls. 300–304.

4. Franz Ritter von Miklosich and Josef Müller, eds., *Acta et diplomata Graeca Medii Aevi sacra et profana collecta*, vol. 2, *Acta patriarchatus Constantinopolitani* (Vienna, 1862), 188–92; relevant passages are translated in John W. Barker, *Manuel II Palaeologus (1391–1425): A Study in Late Byzantine Statesmanship* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers Univ. Press, 1969), 106–9.

5. *Russkaia istoricheskaia biblioteka*, 39 vols. (St. Petersburg, 1872–1927) (hereafter cited as *RIB*), vol. 6, ed. Aleksei Stepanovich Pavlov (1880), cols. 525–36.

6. *RIB* 6: cols. 583–86.

7. See above, n. 4.

8. "Slovo izbrano," in Andrei Nikolaevich Popov, *Istoriko-literaturnyi obzor drevnerusskikh polemicheskikh sochinenii protiv Latinian* (Moscow, 1875), 372–73.

9. The argument appears in letters of Metropolitan Jonas in 1451 (*RIB* 6: cols. 559–60) and other documents; see a review of the texts in Michael Cherniavsky, "The Reception of the Council of Florence in Moscow," *Church History* 24 (1955): 347–59.

10. Monk Thomas, "Slovo pokhval'noe o blagovernom velikom Kniaze Borise Aleksandroviche" (Praise of the Pious Grand Prince Boris Alexandrovich [of Tver]), ed. N. Likhachev, in *Pamiatniki drevnei pis'mennosti i iskusstva*, 168 (Moscow, 1908): 1–15.

11. On this legend, see N. N. Rozov, "Povest' o Novgorodskom belom klobuke kak pamiatnik obshcherusskoi publitsistiki XV veka," in *Trudy otdela drevnerusskoi literatury* 9 (Moscow and Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR, 1953): 178–219; extracts translated in Serge A. Zenkovsky, ed. and trans., *Medieval Russian Epics, Chronicles and Tales*, rev. and enl. ed. (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1974), 326–32. Following the annexation of Novgorod by Muscovy, the white cowl became distinctive of the metropolitans (later the patriarchs) of Moscow. Peter the Great, following his suppression of the patriarchate, bestowed the right to wear a white cowl on all of the metropolitans of the Russian Church—quite a devaluation of an initially papal distinction!

12. Text in Vasilii Nikolaevich Malinin, *Starets Eleazarova Monastyria Filofei i ego poslaniia: Istoriko-literaturnoe izsliedovanie* (Kiev, 1901), app. p. 45. Among the historical studies concerned with the theory of Filofei, the best is probably that of Hildegard Schaeder, *Moskau das dritte Rom: Studien zur Geschichte der politische Theorien in der slawischen Welt*, 2d ed. (Darmstadt: H. Gentner, 1957), 82–117.

13. Interestingly, a *translatio imperii* was suggested to Ivan, not by Russians, but by the Venetian Senate: "Quando stirps mascula deesset imperatoria ad Vestram Illustrissimam Dominationem jure vestri faustissimi conjugii pertineret" (quoted in Aleksei Iakovlevich Shpakov, *Gosudarstvo i tserkov' v ikh vzaimnykh otnosheniiakh v Moskovskom gosudarstve* [Kiev, 1904], 1:43–48).

14. Text recently reprinted with commentary by Antonios-Aimilios Tachiaos, *Peges ekklesiastikes istorias ton orthodoxon Slavon* (Thessaloniki: Athon Kyriakide, 1984), 161–64. It has been shown by Vasilii Eduardovich Regel (*Analecta byzantino-russica* [St. Petersburg, 1891–98], LI–XCVIII) that the signatures of the metropolitans under the *Act* are forgeries. The document is therefore a personal composition of Patriarch Joasaph, lacking synodal approval. Eventually Joasaph was deposed for overstepping his prerogatives.

15. Texts recently reprinted in Tachiaos, *Peges*, 210–20, together with the ideologically important letters of Meletios Pegas to the new patriarch Job of Moscow and to the tsar.

16. "Oude . . . di'allon tina logon . . ., ei me pros ta ton basileion axiomata," *Tomos* of 1593. Tachiaos, *Peges*, 218; and for the preceding quotation 210–11.

17. Tachiaos, *Peges*, 219. There is no special study in English on the events and conditions

of the establishment of the Russian patriarchate. The most authoritative Russian study is by Aleksei Iakovlevich Shpakov, *Gosudarstvo i tserkov' v ikh vzaimnykh otnosheniakh v Moskovskom gosudarstve: Tsarstvovanie Fedora Ivanovicha: Uchrezhdenie patriarshestva v Rossii* (Odessa, 1912); see also an account in Anton V. Kartashev, *Ocherki po istorii russkoi tserkvi*, 2 vols. (Paris: YMCA-Press, 1959), 2:10–47. The original versified description of the events by the Greek archbishop of Elasson, Arsenios, who accompanied Patriarch Jeremiah on his trip to Russia, has been reprinted in Tachiaos, *Peges*, 168–209.

18. There are fundamental pre-Revolutionary Russian studies on the subject; see particularly Vladimir Stepanovich Ikonnikov, *Opyt izsliedovaniia o kul'turnom znachenii Vizantii v russkoi istorii* (Kiev, 1869), Andrei Nikolaevich Murav'ev, *Snosheniia Rossii s vostokom po delam tserkovnym* (St. Petersburg, 1858), and Nikolai Fedorovich Kapterev, *Kharakter otnoshenii Rossii k pravoslavnomu Vostoku v XVI i XVII stolietiiakh* (Sergiev Posad: Izdanie Knizhnago Magazina M. S. Elova, 1914). The first part of Georges Florovsky's *Ways of Russian Theology*, trans. Robert L. Nichols (Belmont, Mass.: Nordland, 1979), is also full of interesting observations concerning the intellectual history of Russia's relations with the "Christian East."

19. There is an abundant secondary literature on Maximus, which is referred to in the brilliant portrait of him drawn recently by Dimitri Obolensky, *Six Byzantine Portraits* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988), 201–19. See also Jack V. Haney, *From Italy to Muscovy: The Life and Works of Maxim the Greek* (Munich: W. Fink, 1973). Maximus's writings and translations include over 365 titles (see A. I. Ivanov, *Literaturnoe nasledie Maksima Greka* [Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo "Nauka," 1969], 39–215), of which only half are published, in an uncritical edition (*Sochineniia prepodobnago Maksima Greka*, 3 vols. in 2 [Kazan, 1859–62]).

20. *Sochineniia prepodobnago Maksima Greka*, 2:319–37.

21. The study by Kapterev (see above, n. 18) contains the most complete information about Nikon's policies. See also Pierre Pascal, *Avvakum et les débuts du Raskol* (1938; rpt. Paris: Mouton, 1963).

22. Texts in Tachiaos, *Peges*, 227–31 and 234–64. The council was attended by the patriarchs Paisios of Alexandria and Macarius of Antioch, as well as by several other Greek prelates.

23. See the excellent recent study by Stephen K. Batalden, *Catherine II's Greek Prelate: Eugenios Voulgaris in Russia (1771–1806)* (Boulder, Colo.: East European Monographs, 1982).

GENDER DIFFERENTIATION AND SOCIAL PRACTICE IN POST-BYZANTINE NAXOS

Aglaia E. Kasdagli

Problems and Sources

IN JUNE 1689 a public warning was posted "in all usual and prominent places" of the capital of Naxos, an island of the Cyclades, in the Aegean Sea. It was signed by mastro Vasilis Lemonitis, a craftsman, and was directed to his wife. His complaint was that, without consulting her husband, she had secretly settled her entire dowry property on her daughter by a first marriage and had not left anything aside for the two children she had had by him. She had no right to do this, the furious husband declared, because "I am the head of my wife and I am the master of her property and I am the one who will go to collect her share of the harvest and it is for this property that I married her."[1]

The end of the story is not on record, but this unique direct contemporary testimony of how the woman's place was perceived is of particular importance for the theme of this paper. The surviving written records reflecting some important aspects of the life of women on Naxos in the seventeenth century provide us with the opportunity to reconstruct, albeit partially and tentatively, the social realities that confronted women in the Greek world of that period, and to note certain links between these realities and those of the Byzantine past.

The problems attending such an investigation are well known. Since the proper place of women has traditionally been considered to be far from the public limelight, their role has been consistently depreciated, constrained, and given accessory status. Until recently historians did not question these biases. Today attempts to redress the balance are often frustrated by the historical records themselves, most of which present the